Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_Y0-BNX-703_6

THE NEW
SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA
OF
RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

EDITED BY

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D.
(*Editor-in-Chief*)

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

CHARLES COLEBROOK SHERMAN
[VOLUMES I—VI]

AND

GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.
(*Associate Editors*)

AND THE FOLLOWING DEPARTMENT EDITORS

CLARENCE AUGUSTINE BECKWITH, D.D.
(*Department of Systematic Theology*)

HENRY KING CARROLL, LL.D.
(*Department of Minor Denominations*)

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.
(*Department of Liturgics and Religious Orders*)

JAMES FREDERIC McCURDY, PH.D., LL.D.
(*Department of the Old Testament*)

HENRY SYLVESTER NASH, D.D.
(*Department of the New Testament*)

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.
(*Department of Church History*)

FRANK HORACE VIZETELLY, F.S.A.
(*Department of Pronunciation and Typography*)

Complete in Twelve Volumes

FUNK AND WAGNALLS COMPANY
NEW YORK AND LONDON

THE NEW
SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA
OF
RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

EDITED BY

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D.
(Editor-in-Chief)

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

CHARLES COLEBROOK SHERMAN
[VOLUMES I—VI]

AND

GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.
(Associate Editors)

AND THE FOLLOWING DEPARTMENT EDITORS

CLARENCE AUGUSTINE BECKWITH, D.D.
(Department of Systematic Theology)

HENRY KING CARROLL, LL.D.
(Department of Minor Denominations)

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.
(Department of Liturgics and Religious Orders)

JAMES FREDERIC McCURDY, PH.D., LL.D.
(Department of the Old Testament)

HENRY SYLVESTER NASH, D.D.
(Department of the New Testament)

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.
(Department of Church History)

FRANK HORACE VIZETELLY, F.S.A.
(Department of Pronunciation and Typography)

VOLUME VI
INNOCENTS — LIUDGER

FUNK AND WAGNALLS COMPANY
NEW YORK AND LONDON

Copyright, 1910, by
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY

Registered at Stationers' Hall, London, England

[Printed in the United States of America]
Published February, 1910

11586

EDITORS

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D.
(Editor-in-Chief.)
Professor of Church History, New York University.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

CHARLES COLEBROOK SHERMAN
Editor in Biblical Criticism and Theology on "The New International Encyclopedia," New York.

GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.
New York, Formerly Professor of Biblical History and Lecturer on Comparative Religion, Bangor Theological Seminary.

DEPARTMENT EDITORS, VOLUME VI

CLARENCE AUGUSTINE BECKWITH, D.D.
(Department of Systematic Theology.)
Professor of Systematic Theology, Chicago Theological Seminary.

HENRY KING CARROLL, LL.D.
(Department of Minor Denominations.)
Secretary of Executive Committee of the Western Section for the Fourth Ecumenical Methodist Conference.

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.
(Department of Liturgics and Religious Orders.)
President of St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, N. Y.

JAMES FREDERICK McCURDY, Ph.D., LL.D.
(Department of the Old Testament.)
Professor of Oriental Languages, University College, Toronto.

HENRY SYLVESTER NASH, D.D.
(Department of the New Testament.)
Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the New Testament, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.
(Department of Church History.)
Professor of Church History, Baylor Theological Seminary (Baylor University), Waco, Tex.

FRANK HORACE VIZETELLY, F.S.A.
(Department of Pronunciation and Typography.)
Managing Editor of the Standard Dictionary, etc., New York City.

CONTRIBUTORS AND COLLABORATORS, VOLUME VI

HANS ACHELIS, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Theology University of Halle.

WILHELM ALTMANN, Ph.D.,
Director of the Deutsche Musiksammlung, Berlin.

FRANKLIN CARL ARNOLD, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Breslau.

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Yale Divinity School.

FERENCZ BALOGH,
Professor of Church History, Reformed Theological Academy, Debreczin, Hungary.

GEORGE JAMES BAYLES, Ph.D.,
Writer on Civil Church Law.

CLARENCE AUGUSTINE BECKWITH, D.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, Chicago Theological Seminary.

JOHANNES BELSHEIM (†),
Late Pastor Emeritus, Christiania, Norway.

RUDOLF BENDIXEN (†),
Late Diaconus in Grimma, Saxony.

KARL BENRATH, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Königsberg.

IMMANUEL GUSTAV ADOLF BENZINGER, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
German Orientalist and Vice-Consul for Holland in Jerusalem.

CARL BERTHEAU, Th.D.,
Pastor of St. Michael's, Hamburg.

BERNHARD BESS, Th.Lic.,
Librarian, University of Halle.

EDWIN MUNSELL BLISS, D.D.,
Author of Books on Missions, Washington, D. C.

EMIL BLOESCH (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Theology, Bern.

HEINRICH BOEHMER, Ph.D.,Th.Lic.,
Professor of Church History, University of Bonn.

AMY GASTON CHARLES AUGUSTE BONET-MAURY, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Church History, Independent School of Divinity, Paris.

GOTTLIEB NATHANAEL BONWETSCH, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Göttingen.

FRIEDRICH BOSSE, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Auxiliary Librarian, University Library, Marburg.

GUSTAV BOSSERT, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Retired Pastor, Stuttgart.

ALBERT BRACKMANN, Ph.D.,
Professor of History, University of Marburg.

FRIEDRICH HEINRICH BRANDES, Th.D.,
Reformed Minister and Chaplain at Bückeburg, Schaumburg-Lippe.

EDUARD BRATKE (†), Ph.D, Th.D.,
Late Professor of Church History, University of Breslau.

FRANTS PEDER WILLIAM BUHL, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Oriental Languages, University of Copenhagen.

KARL BURGER (†), Th.D.,
Late Supreme Consistorial Councilor, Munich.

KARL VON BURK (†), Th.D.,
Late Supreme Councilor in Stuttgart.

HEINRICH CALAMINUS,
Superintendent at Elberfeld.

OTIS CARY, D.D.,
Professor of Homiletics and Practical Sociology, Doshisha Theological School, Kyoto, Japan.

JACQUES EUGÈNE CHOISY, Th.D.,
Pastor in Geneva.

PAUL CHRIST (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology, University of Zurich.

EMILIO COMBA (†), D.D.,
Late Professor of Historical Theology and Homiletics, Waldensian College, Florence, Italy.

HENRY COWAN, D.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Aberdeen, Scotland.

AUGUST HERMANN CREMER (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Greifswald.

FRIEDRICH WILHELM CUNO (†), Th.Lic.,
Late Pastor at Eddigehausen, Hanover.

THOMAS WITTON DAVIES, Ph.D., D.D.,
Professor of Semitic Languages, University College of North Wales, Bangor.

SAMUEL MARTIN DEUTSCH, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Berlin.

ERNST VON DOBSCHUETZ, Th.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis, University of Strasburg.

LEONHARD ERNST DORN,
First Preacher at Nördlingen, Bavaria.

PAUL GOTTFRIED DREWS, Th.D.,
Professor of Practical Theology, University of Halle.

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.,
President of St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, New York.

EMIL EGLI (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Church History, University of Zurich.

LUDWIG ALFRED ERICHSON (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Preacher at St. Thomas', Strasburg, Germany.

RUDOLF EUCKEN, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Philosophy, University of Jena.

GUSTAV WILHELM FRANK (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Dogmatics, Symbolics, and Christian Ethics, University of Vienna.

ALBERT FREYBE (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Emeritus Gymnasial Professor, Parchim, Mecklenburg.

ALBERT FREYSTEDT (†), Th.Lic.,
Late Pastor in Cologne.

EMIL ALBERT FRIEDBERG, Th.D., Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical, Public, and German Law, University of Leipsic.

HEINRICH GELZER (†), Ph.D.,
Late Professor of Classical Philology and Ancient History, University of Jena.

JOHANNES ABRAHAM GERTH VAN WIJK (†), Th.D.,
Late Reformed Church Clergyman at The Hague, Holland.

CHRISTIAN GEYER, Ph.D.,
First Preacher at St. Sebald's, Nuremberg, Germany.

GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.,
Former Professor of Biblical History and Lecturer on Comparative Religion, Bangor Theological Seminary.

KARL GOEBEL (†), Ph.D.,
Late Consistorial Councilor in Posen, Prussia.

LEOPOLD KARL GOETZ, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Philosophy in the Roman Catholic Theological Faculty, University of Bonn.

WALTER GOETZ, Ph.D.,
Professor of History, University of Tübingen.

WILHELM GOETZ, Ph.D.,
Honorary Professor of Geography, Technical High School, and Professor, Military Academy, Munich.

JOHANNES FRIEDRICH GOTTSCHICK (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Ethics, and Practical Theology, Evangelical Theological Faculty, University of Tübingen.

CASPER RENÉ GREGORY, Ph.D., Th.D., D.D., LL.D., Dr.Jur.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis, University of Leipsic.

GEORG GRUETZMACHER, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Extraordinary Professor of Church History, University of Heidelberg.

PETER REINHOLD GRUNDEMANN, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Pastor in Mörz, near Belzig, Prussia.

HERMANN GUTHE, Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Leipsic.

WILHELM HADORN, Th.Lic.,
Pastor in Bern and Lecturer on New Testament Exegesis, University of Bern.

ELOF HALLER,
Gymnasial Professor, Venersborg, Sweden.

ADOLF HARNACK, Ph.D., Th.D., Dr.Jur., M.D.,
General Director of the Royal Library, Berlin.

ALBERT HAUCK, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Leipsic, Editor-in-Chief of the Hauck-Herzog *Realencyklopädie.*

HERMAN HAUPT, Ph.D.,
Professor, and Director of the University Library, Giessen.

AUGUST WILHELM HEGLER (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Church History, University of Tübingen.

KARL FRIEDRICH HEMAN, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Professor of Philosophy, University of Basel.

LUDWIG THEODOR EDGAR HENNECKE, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Pastor in Betheln, Hanover.

HERMANN HERING, Th.D.,
Professor of Philosophy of Religion and Homiletics, University of Halle.

PAUL HINSCHIUS (†), Th.D., Dr.Jur.,
Late Professor of Ecclesiastical Law, University of Berlin.

GEORGE HODGES, D.D., D.C.L.,
Dean of The Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.

FERDINAND HOERSCHELMANN (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Practical Theology, University of Dorpat.

RUDOLF HUGO HOFMANN, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Homiletics and Liturgics, University of Leipsic.

OSWALD HOLDER-EGGER, Ph.D.,
Professor at Berlin and Director for the Publication of the *Monumenta Germaniæ historica.*

KARL HOLL, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Berlin.

ERNST IDELER,
Pastor at Ahrendorf, near Potsdam.

LUDWIG HEINRICH IHMELS, Th.D.,
Professor of Dogmatics, University of Leipsic.

SIMON ISSLEIB, Ph.D.,
Professor Emeritus, University of Bonn.

GEORGE THOMAS JACKSON, M.D.,
Professor of Dermatology, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, New York City.

JOSEPH JACOBS, Litt.D.,
Professor of English Literature and Rhetoric, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York City.

ADOLF HERMANN HEINRICH KAMPHAUSEN (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Bonn.

FERDINAND FRIEDRICH WILHELM KATTENBUSCH, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Dogmatics, University of Halle.

EMIL FRIEDRICH KAUTZSCH, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Halle.

PETER GUSTAV KAWERAU, Th.D.,
Consistorial Councilor, Professor of Practical Theology, and University Preacher, University of Breslau.

WILHELM JULIUS ADOLPH KEIL,
Pastor in Herzogswalde, near Dresden.

JAMES ANDERSON KELSO, Ph.D., D.D.,
Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Literature and President, Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburg, Pa.

HANS KESSLER, Th.D.,
Supreme Consistorial Councilor, Berlin.

HUGO WILHELM PAUL KLEINERT, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Practical Theology, University of Berlin.

HEINRICH AUGUST KLOSTERMANN, Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Kiel.

KARL AUGUST KLUEPFEL (†), Ph.D.,
Late Head Librarian, University of Tübingen.

RUDOLF KOEGEL (†), Th.D., Ph.D.,
Late Court Preacher, Berlin.

CHRISTOPH FRIEDRICH ADOLF KOLB, Th.D.,
Prelate and Court Preacher, Ludwigsburg.

THEODOR FRIEDRICH HERMANN KOLDE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Erlangen.

RICHARD KRAETSCHMAR (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Marburg.

HERMANN GUSTAV EDUARD KRUEGER, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Giessen.

JOHANNES WILHELM KUNZE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology, University of Greifswald.

EUGEN LACHENMANN,
City Pastor, Leonberg, Württemberg.

RICHARD LAUXMANN (†),
Late Diaconus in Stuttgart.

WILLIAM LEE (†), D.D.,
Late Professor of Church History, University of Glasgow.

KARL LUDWIG LEIMBACH (†), Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Late Provincial Councilor for Schools, Hanover, Germany.

EDUARD LEMPP, Ph.D.,
Chief Inspector of the Royal Orphan Asylum, Stuttgart.

FRIEDRICH REINHARD LIPSIUS, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Privat-docent in Symbolics, University of Jena.

GEORG LOESCHE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, Evangelical Theological Faculty, Vienna.

FRIEDRICH ARMIN LOOFS, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Halle.

JOHANN LOSERTH, Ph.D.,
Professor of History, University of Graz.

WILHELM PHILIPP FRIEDRICH FERDINAND LOTZ, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Erlangen.

JAMES FREDERICK McCURDY, Ph.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Oriental Languages, University College, Toronto.

HERMANN MALLET (†),
Late Pastor in Bremen.

PHILIPP MEYER, Th.D.,
Supreme Consistorial Councilor, Hanover.

CARL THEODOR MIRBT, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Marburg.

ERNST FRIEDRICH KARL MUELLER, Th.D.,
Professor of Reformed Theology, University of Erlangen.

GEORG MUELLER, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Inspector of Schools, Leipsic.

JOSEPH THEODOR MUELLER, Th.D.,
Keeper of the Archives in Herrnhut.

NIKOLAUS MUELLER, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Christian Archeology, University of Berlin.

HENRY SYLVESTER NASH, D.D.,
Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the New Testament, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.

CHRISTOF EBERHARD NESTLE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor in the Theological Seminary, Maulbronn, Württemberg.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Church History, Baylor Theological Seminary (Baylor University), Waco, Texas.

FREDERIK KRISTIAN NIELSEN (†), D.D.,
Late Bishop of Aarhus, Denmark.

CONRAD VON ORELLI, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and History of Religion, University of Basel.

CARL PFENDER,
Pastor of St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Paris.

ERWIN PREUSCHEN, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Pastor at Hirschhorn-on-the-Neckar, Germany.

ERNEST CUSHING RICHARDSON, Ph.D.,
Librarian, Princeton University.

GEORG CHRISTIAN RIETSCHEL, Th.D.,
University Preacher and Professor of Practical Theology, University of Leipsic.

SIEGFRIED RIETSCHEL, Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Law, University of Tübingen.

BERNHARD RIGGENBACH (†), D.D.,
Late Pastor in Basel.

KARL ROENNEKE, Th.Lic.,
Superintendent in Gommern, Saxony.

ROBERT WILLIAM ROGERS, Ph.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey.

HENDRIK CORNELIS ROGGE (†), Ph.D.,
Late Professor of History, University of Haarlem.

ARNOLD RUEGG,
Pastor at Birmensdorf and Lecturer at the University of Zurich.

CARL VICTOR RYSSEL (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Theology, University of Zurich.

KARL SCHAARSCHMIDT,
Honorary Professor, University of Bonn.

DAVID SCHLEY SCHAFF, D.D.,
Professor of Church History, Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania.

PHILIPP SCHAFF (†), D.D., LL.D.,
Late Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York, and Editor of the Original SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPÆDIA.

CHRISTOPH GOTTLOB VON SCHEURL (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor in Nuremberg.

REINHOLD SCHMID, Th.Lic.,
Pastor in Oberholzheim, Württemberg.

HEINRICH SCHMIDT (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Theology, University of Erlangen.

KARL SCHMIDT, Th.D.,
Provost at Goldberg, Mecklenburg.

WOLDEMAR GOTTLOB SCHMIDT (†), D.D.,
Late Professor of Theology, University of Leipsic.

CARL WILHELM SCHOELL (†), Ph.D., D.D.,
Late Pastor of the Savoy Church, London.

THEODOR FRIEDRICH SCHOTT (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Librarian and Professor of Theology, University of Stuttgart.

EMIL SCHUERER, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of New Testament Exegesis, University of Göttingen.

JOHANN FRIEDRICH RITTER VON SCHULTE (†), Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Law, University of Bonn.

GUSTAV VON SCHULTHESS-RECHBERG, Th.D.,
Professor cf Systematic Theology, University of Zurich.

VICTOR SCHULTZE, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History and Christian Archeology, University of Greifswald.

OTTO SEEBASS, Ph.D.,
Educator, Leipsic, Germany.

REINHOLD SEEBERG, Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Berlin.

EMIL SEHLING, Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical and Commercial Law, University of Erlangen.

ERNST SELLIN, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Archeology, Evangelical Theological Faculty, Vienna.

CHRISTIAAN SEPP (†), Th.D.,
Late Mennonite Preacher, Leyden.

FRIEDRICH ANTON EMIL SIEFFERT, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Dogmatics and New Testament Exegesis, University of Bonn.

ERNEST GOTTLIEB SIHLER, Ph.D.,
Professor of Latin, New York University.

PHILIPP FRIEDRICH ADOLPH THEODOR SPAETH, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mt. Airy, Philadelphia.

EMIL ELIAS STEINMEYER, Ph.D.,
Professor of German Language and Literature, University of Erlangen.

HERMANN LEBERECHT STRACK, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Extraordinary Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Semitic Languages, University of Berlin.

KARL THIEME, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Dogmatics, University of Leipsic.

PAUL TSCHACKERT, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Göttingen.

JOHANN GERHARD WILHELM UHLHORN (†), Th.D.,
Late Abbot of Lokkum, Germany.

HORACE GRANT UNDERWOOD, D.D.,
Author and Missionary, Seoul, Korea.

SIETRE DOUWES VAN VEEN, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History and Christian Archeology, University of Utrecht.

WILHELM VOLCK (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, University of Rostock.

BENJAMIN BRECKINRIDGE WARFIELD, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Didactic and Polemical Theology, Princeton Theological Seminary.

FRIEDRICH WILHELM HERMANN WASSERSCHLEBEN (†), Ph.D.,
Late Professor of Theology in Giessen.

EDWARD ELIHU WHITFIELD, M.A.,
Plymouth Brother, Retired Public Schoolmaster.

LEIGHTON WILLIAMS, D.D.,
Pastor of the Amity Baptist Church, New York.

JOSEPH DAWSON WILSON, D.D.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Reformed Episcopal Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa.

FRANZ THEODOR RITTER VON ZAHN, Th.D., Litt.D.,
Professor of New Testament Introduction, University of Erlangen.

HEINRICH ZIEGLER,
Pastor Emeritus in Jena.

OTTO ZOECKLER (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Church History and Apologetics, University of Greifswald.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL APPENDIX—VOLS. I—VI

The following list of books is supplementary to the bibliographies given at the end of the articles contained in volumes I.–VI., and brings the literature down to November, 1909. In this list each title entry is printed in capital letters.

Apocrypha: B. Pick, *The Apocryphal Acts*, Chicago, 1909.

Arabia: U. Chauvin, *Bibliographie des ouvrages Arabes ou relatifs aux Arabes publiés dans l'Europe chrétienne de 1810 à 1885.* XI. *Mahomet*, Leipsic, 1909.

Architecture: E. H. Day, *Gothic Architecture in England*, Oxford, 1909.

I. B. S. Holborn, *An Introduction to the Architectures of European Religions*, Edinburgh, 1909.

Armenia: L. Arpee, *The Armenian Awakening*, Chicago, 1909.

Atonement: W. L. Walker, *The Gospel of Reconciliation or Atonement*, Edinburgh, 1909.

Bible Text: J. Drummond, *The Transmission of the Text of the New Testament*, London, 1909.

E. Kautsch, *Die Evangelienzitate des Origens*, Leipsic, 1909.

W. O. E. Oesterley, *Our Bible Text; some Recently discovered Bible Documents*, London, 1909.

Biblical Introduction: F. Egger, *Absolute oder relative Wahrheit der heiligen Schrift? Dogmatisch-kritische Untersuchung einer neuen Theorie*, Brixen, 1909.

A. S. Geden, *Outlines of Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, London, 1909.

E. Jacquier, *Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament*, 4 vols., Paris, 1904–1909.

A. S. Peake, *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament*, London, 1909.

T. Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Eng. transl. under the direction . . . of M. W. Jacobus, assisted by C. S. Thayer), 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1909.

Biblical Theology: W. T. Adeney, *The New Testament Doctrine of Christ*, Edinburgh, 1909.

J. Stalker, *The Ethic of Jesus according to the Synoptic Gospels*, London, 1909.

G. Westphal, *Jahwes Wohnstätten nach den Anschauungen der alten Hebräer*, Giessen, 1908.

Bonaventura: E. Lutz, *Die Psychologie Bonaventuras*, Münster, 1909.

Bowne, B. P.: *Studies in Christianity*, Boston, 1909.

Brooks, P.: In *Heavenly Heretics*, by L. P. Powell, New York, 1909.

Bushnell, H.: In *Heavenly Heretics*, by L. P. Powell, New York, 1909.

Catenæ: O. Lang, *Die Catene des Vaticanus Gr. 72 zum ersten Korintherbrief*, Leipsic, 1909.

Challoner, R.: E. H. Burton, *The Life and Times of Bishop Challoner (1691–1781)*, 2 vols., New York, 1909.

Channing, W. E.: In *Heavenly Heretics*, by L. P. Powell, New York, 1909.

China: J. Ross, *The Original Religion of China*, Edinburgh, 1909.

W. A. Tatchell, *Medical Missions in China in Connection with the Wesleyan Methodist Church*, London, 1909.

J. Webster, *The Revival in Manchuria*, London, 1909.

Christian Socialism: C. B. Thompson, *The Churches and the Wage Earners*, London, 1909.

W. Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, New York, 1907.

Christmas: F. Keppel, *Christmas in Art; the Nativity as depicted by Artists in the 15th and 16th Centuries*, New York, 1909.

H. W. Mabie, *The Book of Christmas*, New York, 1909.

Church History: H. M. Gwatkin, *Early Church History to A. D. 313*, 2 vols., London, 1909.

L. Ragg, *The Church of the Apostles*, New York, 1909.

Church, R. W.: D. C. Lathbury, *Dean Church*, London, 1909.

Comparative Religion: G. Foucart, *La Méthode comparative dans l'histoire des Religions*, Paris, 1909.

S. Reinach, *Orpheus, Histoire Générale des religions*, Paris, 1909; Eng. transl., *Orpheus*, London, 1909.

Covenanters: A. Smellie, *Men of the Covenant*, London, 1903, 7th ed., 1909.

Creation: D. L. Holbrook, *Panorama of Creation*, Philadelphia, 1909.

E. O. James, *God's Eight Days of Creation*, London, 1909.

Denney, J.: *Jesus and the Gospel*, New York, 1909.

Disciples of Christ: J. H. Garrison, *The Story of a Century. A brief historical Sketch and Exposition of the Religious Movement inaugurated by Thomas and Alexander Campbell*, St. Louis, 1909.

Dods, M.: *Footsteps in the Path of Life*, New York, 1909.

Druids: W. F. Tamblyn, in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, Oct., 1909, pp. 21–36 (gathers scattered references).

Edwards, J., the Elder: In *Heavenly Heretics*, by L. P. Powell, New York, 1909.

Ethics: R. L. Ottley, *Christian Ideas and Ideals*, London, 1909.

  H. H. Scullard, *Early Christian Ethics in the West*, London, 1909.

Everett, C. C.: *Theism and the Christian Faith*, New York, 1909.

Faith: W. R. Inge, *Faith*, London, 1909.

Fichte, J. G.: A biographical introduction, by E. Ritchie, is prefixed to the *Vocation of Man*, Chicago, 1906.

Findlay, G. G.: *Fellowship in the Life Eternal*, New York, 1909.

Forsyth, P. T.: *The Cruciality of the Cross*, New York, 1909.

France: J. W. Thompson, *The Wars of Religion in France, 1559–76*, Chicago, 1909.

Francis of Assisi: A. Goffin, *Saint François d'Assise dans la légende et dans l'art primitifs italiens*, Brussels, 1909.

French Revolution: P. de La Gorce, *Histoire religieuse de la révolution française*, Paris, 1909.

Galilee: E. W. G. Masterman, *Studies in Galilee*, Chicago, 1909.

Gardiner, S.: In *Typical English Churchmen*, by J. Gairdner, London, 1909.

Geil, W. E.: *The Great Wall of China*, New York, 1909.

Gerhardt, P.: Two new eds. of the poems are by W. Nelle, Hamburg, 1907, and W. Tümpel, Gütersloh, 1907.

Gladden, W.: *Recollections of Washington Gladden*, Boston, 1909.

God: J. Warschauer, *Problems of Immanence. Studies critical and constructive*, London, 1909.

Gospels: V. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, part 2, *The Synoptic Gospels*, London, 1909.

Hammurabi: *Hammurabis Gesetz*, Germ. transl., by J. Kohler and A. Ungnad, Leipsic, 1909.

Hawaiian Islands: S. Dibble, *A History of the Sandwich Islands*, Cleveland, 1909.

Hebrew Language and Literature: J. W. Rothstein, *Grundzüge des hebräischen Rhythmus und seiner Formenbildung nebst lyrischen Texten mit kritischen Kommentar*, Leipsic, 1909.

Hellenism: W. Otto, *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Aegypten*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1908.

Herbert, G.: Add to bibliograpy, *English Works, newly arranged . . .* by G. H. Palmer, 3 vols., Boston, 1905.

Herrmann, J. G. W.: English transl. of *Der Verkehr*, with title *Communion of the Christian with God*, London, 1895, New York, 1907.

Hexateuch: J. Skinner, *Genesis*, Edinburgh and New York, 1909.

Holy Spirit: H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament. A Study in primitive Christian Teaching*, London, 1909.

Home Missions: A. F. Beard, *A Crusade of Brotherhood; a History of the American Missionary Association*, Boston, 1909.

  H. P. Douglass, *Christian Reconstruction in the South*, Boston, 1909.

Homiletics: F. E. Cartor, *Preaching*, London, 1909.

Huguenots: See France, above.

Hulsean Lectures: J. N. Figgis, *The Gospel and Human Needs. Being the Hulsean Lectures for 1908–09*, London, 1909.

Hymnology: Eveline W. Brainerd, *Great Hymns of the Middle Ages*, New York, 1909.

Idealism: C. Werner, *Aristote et l'idéalisme platonicien*, Paris, 1909.

  W. R. B. Gibson, *God with us. A Study in Religious Idealism*, New York, 1909.

Immortality: C. Lombroso, *After Death—What?* Boston, 1909.

India: *Linguistic Survey of India.* V., 3. *Tibeto-Burman Family.* Part 1. *General Introduction, Specimens of the Tibetan Dialects, the Himalayan Dialects, and the North Assam Group*, comp. and ed. by G. A. Grierson, Calcutta, 1909.

Inscriptions: C. Wessely, *Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde*, vol. viii., Leipsic, 1908.

  M. H. Pognon, *Inscriptions sémitiques de la Syrie, de la Mésopotamie*, Paris, 1908.

  G. Möller, *Hieratische Paläographie*, Leipsic, 1909.

  M. von Oppenheim, *Inschriften aus Syrien, Mesopotamien und Kleinasien, gesammelt auf der Forschungsreise des Jahres 1899*, Leipsic, 1909.

Inspiration and Revelation: *Revelation and Inspiration*, London, 1909.

  T. H. Sprott, *Modern Study of the Old Testament and Inspiration*, London, 1909.

Investiture: E. Bernheim, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Investiturstreites*, Leipsic, 1907.

  J. Drehmann, *Papst Leo IX und die Simonie. Ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung der Vorgeschichte des Investiturstreites*, Leipsic, 1908.

  A. Scharnagl, *Der Begriff der Investitur in den Quellen und der Literatur des Investiturstreites*, Stuttgart, 1908.

Irenaeus: P. Beauzart, *Essai sur la théologie d'Irénée. Études d'histoire des dogmes*, Paris, 1908.

Isaiah: G. H. Box, *The Book of Isaiah*, London, 1908.

  F. Feldmann, *Der Knecht Gottes in Isaias Kap. 40–55*, Freiburg, 1907.

  E. Sellin, *Das Rätsel des deuterojesjanischen Buches*, Leipsic, 1908.

Israel, History of: A. M. Hyamson, *A History of the Jews in England*, London, 1908.

  C. H. H. Wright, *Light from Egyptian Papyri on Jewish History before Christ*, London, 1908.

  A. Alt, *Israel und Aegypten*, Leipsic, 1909.

  A. Buchler, *The Political and Social Leaders of the Jewish Community of Sepphoris in the Second and Third Centuries*, London, 1909.

  W. Caspari, *Aufkommen und Krise des israelitischen Königtums unter David*, Berlin, 1909.

  T. K. Cheyne, *The Decline and Fall of the Kingdom of Judah*, London, 1908.

  S. Funk, *Die Juden in Babylonien 200–500*, vol. ii., Berlin, 1908.

  S. Oppenheim, *The Early History of the Jews in New York, 1657–1664*, in *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, New York, 1909.

  S. Poznanski, *The Karaite Literary Opponents of Saadiah Gaon*, London, 1908.

  S. Schechter, *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, London, 1909.

  N. Slouschz, *Judéo-Berbéres. Recherches sur les origines des juifs et du judaïsme en Afrique*, Paris, 1909.

Jacob (James) of Vitry: *Jacob von Vitry, Leben und Werke*, in *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*, ed. W. Goetz, Leipsic, 1909.

Jainism: Hem Chandra Suri, *Yogosastram*, in Sanskrit, ed. Muni Maharaya Sri Dharmavigay, vol. i., part 1, Calcutta, 1907.

James, Epistle of: J. Belzer, *Die Epistel der heil. Jakobus*, Freiburg, 1909.

Japan: M. Steichen, *The Christian Daimyos: A Century of Religious and Political History in Japan (1549–1650)*, Tokyo, 1909.

N. G. Munro, *Prehistoric Japan*, London, 1908.

Jeremiah: *Commentary of R. Tobia B. Elieser on Echah. Edited for the first time from the MSS. at Cambridge, Oxford, and Munich by A. W. Greenup, Hebrew Text*, London, 1909.

C. H. Cornill, *Das Buch Jeremia erklärt*, Leipsic, 1905.

M. Löhr, *Die Klagelieder des Jeremias übersetzt und erklärt*, Freiburg, 1908.

Jerusalem: C. R. Conder, *The City of Jerusalem*, London, 1909.

D. S. Margoliouth, *Cairo, Jerusalem and Damascus; three chief Cities of the Egyptian Sultans*, New York, 1908.

C. Mommert, *Der Teich Bethesda zu Jerusalem und das Jerusalem des Pilgers von Bordeaux*, Leipsic, 1907.

Jesuits: P. T. Venturi, *Storia della Compagnia di Gesu in Italia;* vol. i., *La vita religiosa in Italia durante la prima eta dell' ordine, con appendice di documenti inediti*, Milan, 1909.

Job: *Book of Job ; Introduction by G. K. Chesterton*, New York, 1909.

John the Apostle: R. Law, *The Tests of Life: a Study of the First Epistle of St. John* (Kerr Lectures for 1909), New York, 1909.

John Baptist: N. Heim, *Johannes. Der Vorläufer des Herrn, nach Bibel, Geschichte und Tradition dargestellt*, Regensburg, 1908.

Josephus: J. Frey, *Der slavische Josephusbericht über die urchristliche Geschichte nebst seiner Parallelen kritisch untersucht*, Leipsic, 1908.

Keble, J: E. F. L. Wood, *John Keble*, in *Leaders of the Church, 1800–1900*, series ed. G. W. E. Russell, Oxford, 1909.

Kings, Books of: F. A. Herzog, *Die Chronologie der beiden Königsbücher*, Münster, 1909.

Lee, J.: W. H. Meredith, *Life of Jesse Lee*, New York, 1909.

Lefroy, W.: H. Leeds, *Life of Dean Lefroy*, London, 1909.

Liturgics: C. G. C. F. Atchley, *The Ambrosian Liturgy done into English*, London, 1909.

G. Rietschel, *Lehrbuch der Liturgik*, vol. ii., *Die Kasualien*, Berlin, 1909.

BIOGRAPHICAL ADDENDA

Bassermann, H. G.: d. in Samaden (70 m. s.s.e. of St. Gall), Switzerland, Aug. 30, 1909.

Belsheim, J.: d. at Christiania July 15, 1909.

Boehmer, E.: d. at Lichtental (a suburb of Baden) Mar. 1, 1906.

Casali del Drago, G. B.: d. at Rome Mar. 17, 1908.

Hare, W. H.: d. at Atlantic City, N. J., Oct. 23, 1909.

Madsen, P.: elected bishop of Zealand, 1909.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations in common use or self-evident are not included here. For additional information concerning the works listed, see vol. i., pp. viii.–xx., and the appropriate articles in the body of the work.

ADB	*Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, Leipsic, 1875 sqq., vol. 53, 1907
Adv	*adversus*, " against "
AJP	*American Journal of Philology*, Baltimore, 1880 sqq.
AJT	*American Journal of Theology*, Chicago, 1897 sqq.
AKR	*Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht*, Innsbruck, 1857–61, Mainz, 1872 sqq.
ALKG	*Archiv für Litteratur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, Freiburg, 1885 sqq.
Am	American
AMA	*Abhandlungen der Münchener Akademie*, Munich, 1763 sqq.
ANF	*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, American edition by A. Cleveland Coxe, 8 vols. and index, Buffalo, 1887; vol. ix., ed. Allan Menzies, New York, 1897
Apoc	Apocrypha, apocryphal
Apol	*Apologia, Apology*
Arab	Arabic
Aram	Aramaic
art	article
Art. Schmal	Schmalkald Articles
ASB	*Acta sanctorum*, ed. J. Bolland and others, Antwerp, 1643 sqq.
ASM	*Acta sanctorum ordinis S. Benedicti*, ed. J. Mabillon, 9 vols., Paris, 1668–1701
Assyr	Assyrian
A. T	*Altes Testament*, " Old Testament "
Augs. Con	Augsburg Confession
A. V	Authorized Version (of the English Bible)
AZ	*Allgemeine Zeitung*, Augsburg, Tübingen, Stuttgart, and Tübingen, 1798 sqq.
Baldwin, *Dictionary*	J. M. Baldwin, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, 3 vols. in 4, New York, 1901–05
Bayle, *Dictionary*	*The Dictionary Historical and Critical of Mr. Peter Bayle*, 2d ed., 5 vols., London, 1734–38.
Benzinger, *Archäologie*	I. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*, 2d ed., Freiburg, 1907
BFBS	British and Foreign Bible Society
Bingham, *Origines*	J. Bingham, *Origines ecclesiasticæ*, 10 vols., London, 1708–22; new ed., Oxford, 1855
Bouquet, *Recueil*	M. Bouquet, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, continued by various hands, 23 vols., Paris, 1738–76
Bower, *Popes*	Archibald Bower, *History of the Popes . . . to 1758, continued by S. H. Cox*, 3 vols., Philadelphia, 1845–47
BQR	*Baptist Quarterly Review*, Philadelphia, 1867 sqq.
BRG	See Jaffé
Cant	Canticles, Song of Solomon
cap	*caput*, " chapter "
Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*	R. Ceillier, *Histoire des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques*, 16 vols. in 17, Paris, 1858–69
Chron	*Chronicon*, " Chronicle "
I Chron	I Chronicles
II Chron	II Chronicles
CIG	*Corpus inscriptionum Græcarum*, Berlin, 1825 sqq.
CIL	*Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin, 1863 sqq.
CIS	*Corpus inscriptionum Semiticarum*, Paris, 1881 sqq.
cod	codex
cod. D	*codex Bezæ*
cod. Theod	*codex Theodosianus*
Col	Epistle to the Colossians
col., cols	column, columns
Conf	*Confessiones*, " Confessions "
I Cor	First Epistle to the Corinthians
II Cor	Second Epistle to the Corinthians
COT	See Schrader
CQR	*The Church Quarterly Review*, London, 1875 sqq.
CR	*Corpus reformatorum*, begun at Halle, 1834, vol. lxxxix., Berlin and Leipsic, 1905 sqq.
Creighton, *Papacy*	M. Creighton, *A History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome*, new ed., 6 vols., New York and London, 1897
CSCO	*Corpus scriptorum Christianorum orientalium*, ed. J. B. Chabot, I. Guidi, and others, Paris and Leipsic, 1903 sqq.
CSEL	*Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, Vienna, 1867 sqq.
CSHB	*Corpus scriptorum historiæ Byzantinæ*, 49 vols., Bonn, 1828–78
Currier, *Religious Orders*	C. W. Currier, *History of Religious Orders*, New York, 1896
D	Deuteronomist
DACL	F. Cabrol, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, Paris, 1903 sqq.
Dan	Daniel
DB	J. Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, 4 vols. and extra vol., Edinburgh and New York, 1898–1904
DCA	W. Smith and S. Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, 2 vols., London, 1875–80
DCB	W. Smith and H. Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, 4 vols., Boston, 1877–87
DCG	J. Hastings, J. A. Selbie, and J. C. Lambert, *A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, 2 vols., Edinburgh and New York, 1906–1908.
Deut	Deuteronomy
De vir. ill	*De viris illustribus*
DGQ	See Wattenbach
DNB	L. Stephen and S. Lee, *Dictionary of National Biography*, 63 vols. and supplement 3 vols., London, 1885–1901
Driver, *Introduction*	S. R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 5th ed., New York, 1894
E	Elohist
EB	T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, 4 vols., London and New York, 1899–1903
Eccl	*Ecclesia*, " Church "; *ecclesiasticus*, " ecclesiastical "
Eccles	Ecclesiastes
Ecclus	Ecclesiasticus
ed	edition; *edidit*, " edited by "
Eph	Epistle to the Ephesians
Epist	*Epistola, Epistolæ*, " Epistle," " Epistles "
Ersch and Gruber, *Encyklopädie*	J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, Leipsic, 1818 sqq.
E. V	English versions (of the Bible)
Ex	Exodus
Ezek	Ezekiel
fasc	*fasciculus*
Fr	French
Friedrich, *KD*	J. Friedrich, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, 2 vols., Bamberg, 1867–69
Gal	Epistle to the Galatians
Gams, *Series episcoporum*	P. B. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, Regensburg, 1873, and supplement, 1886
Gee and Hardy, *Documents*	H. Gee and W. J. Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, London, 1896
Gen	Genesis
Germ	German
GGA	*Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, Göttingen, 1824 sqq.
Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*	E. Gibbon, *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. J. B. Bury, 7 vols., London, 1896–1900
Gk	Greek,
Gross, *Sources*	C. Gross, *The Sources and Literature of English History . . . to 1485*, London, 1900
Hab	Habakkuk

Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*	A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1869–78
Hær	Refers to patristic works on heresies or heretics, Tertullian's *De præscriptione*, the *Pros haireseis* of Irenæus, the *Panarion* of Epiphanius, etc.
Hag	Haggai
Harduin, *Concilia*	J. Harduin, *Conciliorum collectio regia maxima*, 12 vols., Paris, 1715
Harnack, *Dogma*	A. Harnack, *History of Dogma . . . from the 3d German edition*, 7 vols., Boston, 1895–1900
Harnack, *Litteratur*	A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, 2 vols. in 3, Leipsic, 1893–1904
Hauck, *KD*	A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, vol. i., Leipsic, 1904; vol. ii., 1900; vol. iii., 1906; vol. iv., 1903
Hauck-Herzog, *RE*	*Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, founded by J. J. Herzog, 3d ed. by A. Hauck, Leipsic, 1896–1909
Heb	Epistle to the Hebrews
Hebr	Hebrew
Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*	C. J. von Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, continued by J. Hergenröther, vols. i.–vi., viii.–ix., Freiburg, 1883–93
Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*	M. Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche*, 2d ed. 3 vols., Paderborn, 1907
Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*	P. Helyot, *Histoire des ordres monastiques, religieux et militaires*, 8 vols., Paris, 1714–19; new ed., 1839–42
Henderson, *Documents*	E. F. Henderson, *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, London, 1892
Hist	History, *histoire, historia*
Hist. eccl.	*Historia ecclesiastica, ecclesiæ*, "Church History"
Hom	*Homilia, homiliai*, "homily, homilies"
Hos	Hosea
Isa	Isaiah
Ital	Italian
J	Jahvist (Yahwist)
JA	*Journal Asiatique*, Paris, 1822 sqq.
Jacobus, *Dictionary*	*A Standard Bible Dictionary*, ed. M. W. Jacobus, . . . E. E. Nourse, . . . and A. C. Zenos, New York and London, 1909.
Jaffé, *BRG*	P. Jaffé, *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum*, 6 vols., Berlin, 1864–73
Jaffé, *Regesta*	P. Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum . . . ad annum 1198*, Berlin, 1851; 2d ed., Leipsic, 1881–88
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, New Haven, 1849 sqq.
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, first appeared as *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, Middletown, 1882–88, then Boston, 1890 sqq.
JE	*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 12 vols., New York, 1901–06
JE	The combined narrative of the Jahvist (Yahwist) and Elohist
Jer	Jeremiah
Josephus, *Ant*	Flavius Josephus, "Antiquities of the Jews"
Josephus, *Apion*	Flavius Josephus, "Against Apion"
Josephus, *Life*	Life of Flavius Josephus
Josephus, *War*	Flavius Josephus, "The Jewish War"
Josh	Joshua
JPT	*Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, Leipsic, 1875 sqq.
JQR	*The Jewish Quarterly Review*, London, 1888 sqq.
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, London, 1834 sqq.
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*, London, 1899 sqq.
Julian, *Hymnology*	J. Julian, *A Dictionary of Hymnology*, revised edition, London, 1907
JWT	*Jaarboeken voor Wetenschappelijke Theologie*, Utrecht, 1845 sqq.
KAT	See Schrader
KB	See Schrader
KD	See Friedrich, Hauck, Rettberg
KL	*Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlexikon*, 2d ed., by J. Hergenröther and F. Kaulen, 12 vols., Freiburg, 1882–1903
Krüger, *History*	G. Krüger, *History of Early Christian Literature in the First Three Centuries*, New York, 1897
Krumbacher, *Geschichte*	K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 2d ed., Munich, 1897
Labbe, *Concilia*	P. Labbe, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 31 vols., Florence and Venice, 1759–98
Lam	Lamentations
Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist*	J. Lanigan, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland to the 13th Century*, 4 vols., Dublin, 1829
Lat	Latin, Latinized
Leg	*Leges, Legum*
Lev	Leviticus
Lichtenberger, *ESR*	F. Lichtenberger, *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses*, 13 vols., Paris, 1877–1882
Lorenz, *DGQ*	O. Lorenz, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, 3d ed., Berlin, 1887
LXX	The Septuagint
I Macc	I Maccabees
II Macc	II Maccabees
Mai, *Nova collectio*	A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, 10 vols., Rome, 1825–38
Mal	Malachi
Mann, *Popes*	R. C. Mann, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, London, 1902 sqq.
Mansi, *Concilia*	G. D. Mansi, *Sanctorum conciliorum collectio nova*, 31 vols., Florence and Venice, 1728
Matt	Matthew
MGH	*Monumenta Germaniæ historica*, ed. G. H. Pertz and others, Hanover and Berlin, 1826 sqq. The following abbreviations are used for the sections and subsections of this work: *Ant.*, *Antiquitates*, "Antiquities"; *Auct. ant.*, *Auctores antiquissimi*, "Oldest Writers", *Chron. min.*, *Chronica minora*, "Lesser Chronicles"; *Dip.*, *Diplomata*, "Diplomas, Documents"; *Epist.*, *Epistolæ*, "Letters"; *Gest. pont. Rom.*, *Gesta pontificum Romanorum*, "Deeds of the Popes of Rome"; *Leg.*, *Leges*, "Laws"; *Lib. de lite*, *Libelli de lite inter regnum et sacerdotium sæculorum xi. et xii. conscripti*, "Books concerning the Strife between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Authorities in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries"; *Nec.*, *Necrologia Germaniæ*, "Necrology of Germany"; *Poet. Lat. ævi Car.*, *Poetæ Latini ævi Carolini*, "Latin Poets of the Caroline Time"; *Poet. Lat. med. ævi*, *Poetæ Latini medii ævi*, "Latin Poets of the Middle Ages"; *Script.*, *Scriptores*, "Writers"; *Script. rer. Germ.*, *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum*, "Writers on German Subjects"; *Script. rer. Langob.*, *Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum*, "Writers on Lombard and Italian Subjects"; *Script. rer. Merov.*, *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum*, "Writers on Merovingian Subjects"
Mic	Micah
Milman, *Latin Christianity*	H. H. Milman, *History of Latin Christianity, Including that of the Popes to . . . Nicholas V.*, 8 vols., London, 1860–61
Mirbt, *Quellen*	C. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholicismus*, Tübingen, 1901
MPG	J. P. Migne, *Patrologiæ cursus completus, series Græca*, 162 vols., Paris, 1857–66
MPL	J. P. Migne, *Patrologiæ cursus completus, series Latinæ*, 221 vols., Paris, 1844–64
MS., MSS	Manuscript, Manuscripts
Muratori, *Scriptores*	L. A. Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum scriptores*, 28 vols., 1723–51
NA	*Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, Hanover, 1876 sqq.
Nah	Nahum
n.d.	no date of publication
Neander, *Christian Church*	A. Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, 6 vols., and index, Boston, 1872–81
Neh	Nehemiah
Niceron, *Mémoires*	R. P. Niceron, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustrés . . .*, 43 vols., Paris, 1729–45
NKZ	*Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, Leipsic, 1890 sqq.
Nowack, *Archäologie*	W. Nowack, *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Archäologie*, 2 vols., Freiburg, 1894
n.p.	no place of publication
NPNF	*The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 1st series, 14 vols., New York, 1887–92; 2d series, 14 vols., New York, 1890–1900
N. T	New Testament, *Novum Testamentum, Nouveau Testament, Neues Testament*
Num	Numbers
Ob	Obadiah

O. S. B.	*Ordo sancti Benedicti*, "Order of St. Benedict"
O. T.	Old Testament
OTJC	See Smith
P	Priestly document
Pastor, *Popes*	L. Pastor, *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*, 8 vols., London, 1891–1908
PEA	*Patres ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, ed. J. A. Giles, 34 vols., London, 1838–46
PEF	Palestine Exploration Fund
I Pet	First Epistle of Peter
II Pet	Second Epistle of Peter
Platina, *Popes*	B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes from . . . Gregory VII. to . . . Paul II.*, 2 vols., London, n.d.
Pliny, *Hist. nat.*	Pliny, *Historia naturalis*
Potthast, *Wegweiser*	A. Potthast, *Bibliotheca historica medii ævi. Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke*, Berlin, 1896
Prov	Proverbs
Ps	Psalms
PSBA	*Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archeology*, London, 1880 sqq.
q.v., qq.v	*quod (quæ) vide*, "which see"
R	Redactor
Ranke, *Popes*	L. von Ranke, *History of the Popes*, 3 vols., London, 1906
RDM	*Revue des deux mondes*, Paris, 1831 sqq.
RE	See Hauck-Herzog
Reich, *Documents*	E. Reich, *Select Documents Illustrating Mediæval and Modern History*, London, 1905
REJ	*Revue des études juives*, Paris, 1880 sqq.
Rettberg, *KD*	F. W. Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, 2 vols., Göttingen, 1846–48
Rev	Book of Revelation
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, Paris, 1880 sqq.
Richardson, *Encyclopaedia*	E. C. Richardson, *Alphabetical Subject Index and Index Encyclopaedia to Periodical Articles on Religion, 1890–99*, New York, 1907.
Richter, *Kirchenrecht*	A. L. Richter, *Lehrbuch des katholischen und evangelischen Kirchenrechts*, 8th ed. by W. Kahl, Leipsic, 1886
Robinson, *Researches*, and *Later Researches*	E. Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, Boston, 1841, and *Later Biblical Researches in Palestine*, 3d ed. of the whole, 3 vols., 1867
Robinson, *European History*	J. H. Robinson, *Readings in European History*, 2 vols., Boston, 1904–06
Robinson and Beard, *Modern Europe*	J. H. Robinson, and C. A. Beard, *Development of Modern Europe*, 2 vols., Boston, 1907
Rom	Epistle to the Romans
RSE	*Revue des sciences ecclésiastiques*, Arras, 1860–74, Amiens, 1875 sqq.
RTP	*Revue de théologie et de philosophie*, Lausanne, 1873
R. V.	Revised Version (of the English Bible)
sæc	*sæculum*, "century"
I Sam	I Samuel
II Sam	II Samuel
SBA	*Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, Berlin, 1882 sqq.
SBE	F. Max Müller and others, *The Sacred Books of the East*, Oxford, 1879 sqq., vol. xlviii., 1904
SBOT	*Sacred Books of the Old Testament* ("Rainbow Bible"), Leipsic, London, and Baltimore, 1894 sqq.
Schaff, *Christian Church*	P. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vols. i.–iv., vi., vii., New York, 1882–92, vol. v., part 1, by D. S. Schaff, 1907
Schaff, *Creeds*	P. Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, 3 vols., New York, 1877–84
Schrader, *COT*	E. Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, 2 vols., London, 1885–88
Schrader, *KAT*	E. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1902–03
Schrader, *KB*	E. Schrader, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, 6 vols., Berlin, 1889–1901
Schürer, *Geschichte*	E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 4th ed., 3 vols., Leipsic, 1902 sqq.; Eng. transl., 5 vols., New York, 1891
Script	*Scriptores*, "writers"
Scrivener, *Introduction*	F. H. A. Scrivener, *Introduction to New Testament Criticism*, 4th ed., London, 1894
Sent	*Sententiæ*, "Sentences"
S. J.	*Societas Jesu*, "Society of Jesus"
SMA	*Sitzungsberichte der Münchener Akademie*, Munich, 1860 sqq.
Smith, *Kinship*	W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, London, 1903
Smith, *OTJC*	W. R. Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, London, 1892
Smith, *Prophets*	W. R. Smith, *Prophets of Israel . . . to the Eighth Century*, London, 1895
Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*	W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, London, 1894
S. P. C. K.	Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge
S. P. G.	Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts
sq., sqq	and following
Strom	*Stromata*, "Miscellanies"
s.v.	sub voce, or sub verbo
Swete, *Introduction*	H. B. Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, London, 1900
Syr	Syriac
TBS	Trinitarian Bible Society
Thatcher and McNeal, *Source Book*	O. J. Thatcher and E. H. McNeal, *A Source Book for Mediæval History*, New York, 1905
I Thess	First Epistle to the Thessalonians
II Thess	Second Epistle to the Thessalonians
ThT	*Theologische Tijdschrift*, Amsterdam and Leyden, 1867 sqq.
Tillemont, *Mémoires*	L. S. le Nain de Tillemont, *Mémoires . . . ecclésiastiques des six premiers siècles*, 16 vols., Paris, 1693–1712
I Tim	First Epistle to Timothy
II Tim	Second Epistle to Timothy
TJB	*Theologischer Jahresbericht*, Leipsic, 1882–1887, Freiburg, 1888, Brunswick, 1889–1897, Berlin, 1898 sqq.
TLB	*Theologisches Litteraturblatt*, Bonn, 1866 sqq.
TLZ	*Theologische Litteraturzeitung*, Leipsic, 1876 sqq.
Tob	Tobit
TQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift*, Tübingen, 1819 sqq.
TS	J. A. Robinson, *Texts and Studies*, Cambridge, 1891 sqq.
TSBA	*Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, London, 1872 sqq.
TSK	*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, Hamburg, 1826 sqq.
TU	*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur*, ed. O. von Gebhardt and A. Harnack, Leipsic, 1882 sqq.
TZT	*Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, Tübingen, 1838–40
Ugolini, *Thesaurus*	B. Ugolinus, *Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum*, 34 vols., Venice, 1744–69
V. T.	*Vetus Testamentum*, *Vieux Testament*, "Old Testament"
Wattenbach, *DGQ*	W. Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, 5th ed., 2 vols., Berlin, 1885; 6th ed., 1893–94
Wellhausen, *Heidentum*	J. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, Berlin, 1887
Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*	J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 6th ed., Berlin, 1905, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1885
ZA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Leipsic, 1886–88, Berlin, 1889 sqq.
Zahn, *Einleitung*	T. Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 3d ed., Leipsic, 1907
Zahn, *Kanon*	T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1888–92
ZATW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Giessen, 1881 sqq.
ZDAL	*Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum und deutsche Literatur*, Berlin, 1876 sqq.
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Leipsic, 1847 sqq.
ZDP	*Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, Halle, 1869 sqq.
ZDPV	*Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, Leipsic, 1878 sqq.
Zech	Zechariah
Zeph	Zephaniah
ZHT	*Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie*, published successively at Leipsic, Hamburg, and Gotha, 1832–75
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Gotha, 1876 sqq.
ZKR	*Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht*, Berlin, Tübingen, Freiburg, 1861 sqq.
ZKT	*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, Innsbruck, 1877 sqq.
ZKW	*Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben*, Leipsic, 1880–89
ZNTW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Giessen, 1900 sqq.
ZPK	*Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche*, Erlangen, 1838–76
ZWT	*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, Jena, 1858–60, Halle, 1861–67, Leipsic, 1868 sqq.

SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION

The following system of transliteration has been used for Hebrew:

א = ' or omitted at the beginning of a word.
בּ = b
ב = bh or b
גּ = g
ג = gh or g
דּ = d
ד = dh or d
ה = h
ו = w
ז = z
ח = ḥ
ט = ṭ
י = y
כּ = k
כ = kh or k
ל = l
מ = m
נ = n
ס = s
ע = ʻ
פּ = p
פ = ph or p
צ = ẓ
ק = ḳ
ר = r
שׂ = s
שׁ = sh
תּ = t
ת = th or t

The vowels are transcribed by a, e, i, o, u, without attempt to indicate quantity or quality. Arabic and other Semitic languages are transliterated according to the same system as Hebrew. Greek is written with Roman characters, the common equivalents being used.

KEY TO PRONUNCIATION

When the pronunciation is self-evident the titles are not respelled; when by mere division and accentuation it can be shown sufficiently clearly the titles have been divided into syllables, and the accented syllables indicated.

ɑ	as in sof*a*	ɵ	as in not	iu	as in d*u*ration
ɑ̄	" " *a*rm	ɵ̄	" " nor	c = k	" " *c*at
a	" " *a*t	u	" " full[2]	ch	" " *ch*urch
ā	" " f*a*re	ū	" " r*u*le	cw = qu	as in *qu*een
e	" " pen[1]	ʊ	" " b*u*t	dh (*th*)	" " *th*e
ê	" " fate	ʊ̄	" " b*u*rn	f	" " *f*ancy
i	" " t*i*n	ɑi	" " p*i*ne	g (hard)	" " *g*o
î	" " mach*i*ne	ɑu	" " *ou*t	H	" " lo*ch* (Scotch)
o	" " *o*bey	ɵi	" " *oi*l	hw (*wh*)	" " *wh*y
ō	" " n*o*	iū	" " *f*ew	j	" " *j*aw

---

[1] In accented syllables only; in unaccented syllables it approximates the sound of e in over. The letter ṇ, with a dot beneath it, indicates the sound of n as in ink. Nasal n (as in French words) is rendered n.

[2] In German and French names ü approximates the sound of u in d*u*ne.

THE NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

INNOCENTS, FEAST OF THE HOLY: A church festival in honor of the children slain by Herod in Bethlehem (Matt. ii. 16–18). They were very early regarded as Christian martyrs, as Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and many later authors speak of them in that way. At what time the festival became commonly celebrated is not known. In the fifth century the holy innocents were commemorated in connection with the adoration of the Magi at the feast of Epiphany. The Carthaginian calendar, edited by Mabillon from a manuscript of the seventh century, has the entry opposite Dec. 28 "(the day) of the holy children slain by Herod." This day is still kept by the Roman Catholic and Protestant Episcopal churches, but the Greek Church observes Dec. 29. In course of time the feast received an octave. (A. HAUCK.)

In the *Saturnalia* (II., 4, 11) of Macrobius, the Roman writer in the fifth century, is this anecdote: "When he (Augustus) heard that among the boys whom in Syria Herod, the king of the Jews, had ordered to be killed there were infants of two years and under, he exclaimed: 'I had rather be a pig of Herod's than a son.'" As the *Saturnalia* contains many anecdotes which carry with them indubitable evidence of being of contemporary origin, there is no reason for supposing that this one was the creation of a time subsequent to Augustus, but every probability that it, too, was contemporary, and so is an incidental, undesigned, but striking witness to the truthfulness of the Gospel story. E. G. SIHLER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bingham, *Origines*, XX., vii. 12; J. C. W. Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, i. 304 sqq., Leipsic, 1817; P. Gueranger, *L'Année liturgique*, i. 366 sqq., Paris, 1880; W. E. Addis and T. Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, pp. 487–488, London, 1903; G. Wissowa, *Analecta Macrobiana*, in *Hermes*, xvi. 499 sqq.

INQUISITION.

I. In the Older Church.
II. The Inquisition in the Middle Ages.
  Organization and Competence (§ 1).
  Relation to the Secular Powers (§ 2).
  In Italy (§ 3).
  France (§ 4).
  Spain (§ 5).
  Germany, the Netherlands, and England (§ 6).
III. The Inquisition and the Counter-Reformation.
  The Reformation Suppressed in Italy (§ 1).
  In Spain and the Netherlands (§ 2).

I. In the Older Church: The Inquisition (*Inquisitio hæreticæ pravitatis*) or the "Holy Office" (*Sanctum officium*) is the name of the spiritual court of the Roman Catholic Church for the detection and punishment of those whose opinions differ from the doctrines of the Church. It was a comparatively late outgrowth of ancient ecclesiastical discipline. "In the primitive Church there was no arrangement that could have borne even a remote resemblance to the Inquisition. . . The whole instinct and the prevailing cast of thought of Christendom in the first four centuries was opposed to compulsion in religious affairs." (J. J. I. von Döllinger, *Kleinere Schriften*, p. 295, Stuttgart, 1890.) The institution of "elder for repentance" (see PENITENTIARY), which occurs in the third century, bears quite a different character, as the very name denotes. Of course deviations in the sphere of Christian doctrine were combated, but hardly with other than spiritual weapons; and this practise continued until Theodosius (d. 395), before a Christian emperor found it advisable to impose an ultimate death penalty on (Manichean) heresy. Chrysostom repudiated such action: "It is not right to put a heretic to death, since an implacable war would be brought into the world" (*Hom.* xlvi. on Matt. xiii. 24–30); and still in the neighborhood of 450 the church historian Socrates characterized persecution for heresy as foreign to the orthodox Church. Nevertheless, in the meantime Augustine, in his conflict with the Donatists, had set up the contrary doctrine in the West and had recommended compulsion as well as penalties against heretics (*Epist.* xciii., clxxxv.), though he did not approve the death penalty. Six centuries more passed before the theory of religious compulsion and of the violent extirpation of heresy came to have universal validity, although Pope Leo I. (*Epist.* xv., *ad Turribium*) had approved it in the fifth century. This long season of comparative tolerance is the more impressive in view of the circumstance that in Italy under East Gothic and Lombard rule, Catholics and Arians lived whole centuries in close proximity, or even together (as in Ravenna). The impulse to more severe methods came from the decision that the numerous remnants of paganism must be finally rooted out; and certain measures in this direction were devised by the Carolingian legislation (*Capitularia Caroli Magni* of 769 and 813). The beginnings of episcopal inquisition are thus to be sought in the synodal courts for investigations with reference to heresy (see SYNODAL COURTS; and cf. P. Hinschius, *Katholisches Kirchenrecht*, v. 427, Berlin, 1895).

1. Organization and Competence.

II. The Inquisition in the Middle Ages: By the terms of their negotiations at Verona in 1184, Pope Lucius III. and Emperor Frederick Barbarossa converted the episcopal inquisition into a universal institution, to be unconditionally supported by the temporal power. This was the period when a new and dangerous doctrine, commingling Christian and pagan elements in the manner of the ancient Gnostic speculations, diffused itself by way of the East, and lent its aid to popular religious antagonism that was constantly inflamed by the conditions of the worldly fashioned hierarchy (manifested by the Patarenes, Arnold of Brescia, the Waldenses, and others).* By 1179, the followers of the new doctrine had become so numerous, especially in southern France (see New Manicheans) that Alexander III. urged the plan of suppressing them forcibly. Innocent III. (d. 1216) organized a systematic religious war against them; and among the agencies everywhere employed were the episcopal inquisitions, with their modes of operation guaranteed by the agreement at Verona and the ready support of all temporal tribunals. However, this form of the Inquisition appeared even to Honorius III. (d. 1227) subject to obstruction, and not swift or comprehensive enough in its workings, for want of centralization. He and his successor, Gregory IX., grasped the entire procedure in a single hand, thus creating the new form of papal inquisition, which now received the specific name of *Sanctum officium* in distinction from the episcopal office. The most exact information as to this institution is furnished by Eymerich's *Directorium.* The officers are accountable directly to the pope. It is not the bishop who stands at their head, but the grand inquisitor, who is reinforced with notaries, consultors on the judicial side, servants and attendants of every sort (e.g., jailers) on the practical side. In the Venetian Republic, each case was tried with a supplementary attendance of three "learned in heresy," who safeguarded the interests of the State. The new institution was accorded important privileges, in fact, full power in the ecclesiastical province; the officers, being commissioned by the pope directly, were independent of the bishops, and, protected by high prerogatives, were inviolable and immune. All their privileges were newly confirmed to them in 1458 by the bull *Injunctum nobis*, and again in 1570 by the constitution *Sacrosanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ.* After the Dominican order had arisen in the thirteenth century, and its adherents had shown themselves exceptionally qualified, the office was transferred to them especially, though not to the exclusion of members of other orders. The inquisitors' official powers were great, including sentence of excommunication and interdict, suspension of those under suspicion, and adjudication of all sorts of Exemption (q.v.). The trial proceedings were held either in special court rooms or in the official diocesan court. For the trial in its different stages, for the imposition of the penalty, and the like, the most exact prescriptions are extant, and these were continually supplemented as occasion demanded. But for all the exceedingly detailed form of procedure, much was left to the inquisitor's discretion. The new papal tribunal encroached in various ways upon the sphere of the episcopal inquisition, and conflicts of jurisdiction arose, which the popes did not always find it easy to adjust, because, in any case, the episcopal inquisition was not to be abrogated. Nevertheless, in a critical case, the higher authority was lodged in the inquisitor, and his executive scope was more extended than that of the episcopal officials. Charges of heresy against bishops, and even nuncios, were subject to the papal inquisitors.

2. Relation to the Secular Powers.

The unconditional support of the secular arm was invoked for the papal inquisition by virtue of the Veronese agreement (though this was not properly made for that end). The secular arm was "executor," or "minister" of the inquisition. The popes constantly strove to get the cooperation of the secular powers embodied in state laws, municipal statutes, and the like. To this end Innocent IV., in the bull *Ad exstirpanda*, conceded to the State a portion of the property to be confiscated; and the State in return assumed the odium and burden of inflicting the penalty, even to capital execution, if need were. The first instance of an execution under imputation of heresy was supplied in 385 by the usurper Maximus (see Priscillian)—an event by no means approved by Augustine. While the Veronese agreement left the question open, King Peter of Aragon, as early as 1197, threatened the death penalty against heretics who did not submit to the decree of expulsion; and in the course of the thirteenth century this threat was enforced in the widest terms. Even the Emperor Frederick II., "free-thinking" man though he was reputed to be, decreed the death penalty for Lombardy in 1224; for Sicily in 1230; and, with Gregory IX., for Rome in 1231. The sentence itself was determined, as might be expected, by the ecclesiastical (papal) court; whereupon the execution was committed to the temporal authorities. Hence it is possible for certain apologists of the Roman Church to urge that the Church of Rome has never shed blood (cf. *Die Selbstbiographie des Cardinals Bellarmins*, ed. J. J. I. von Döllinger and F. H. Reusch, pp. 233 sqq., Bonn, 1887).

3. In Italy.

This new form of the Inquisition was now made effective with iron strictness in Italy, France, the Netherlands, and England. In Italy, which, especially in the north and central regions, was honeycombed with heresy, the situation was managed by Innocent III. At Viterbo, for example, proceedings were instituted with unexampled severity against the Paterenes in 1207 (cf. Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum scriptores*, iii., 1, Milan, 1723). The civil strife that was stirred up led repeatedly—as at Viterbo in 1265, in Parma, 1277—to the expulsion of the inquisitors; they were even slain, as Peter Martyr at Verona in

---

*There is no evidence that Arnold of Brescia or the Waldenses commingled pagan elements with Christian. On the contrary, they combated with the utmost decision the pagan elements that had been incorporated in the doctrines and practise of the dominant Church. They appear to have been absolutely free from Manichean or Gnostic tendencies.
A.H.N.

1245, who thus became the saint of the Inquisition. "But this occasioned frightful vengeance . . . If the complaints became too loud, a pope did indeed now and then serve a note of reproof on the inquisitor; but it does not appear that so much as one pope wished to lop the institution's rankest outcrops" (Döllinger, ut sup.). For the detailed procedure, cf. Lea, vol. ii., chap. iv. A special arrangement prevailed at Venice in the interest of the State, but a milder policy in this case was exceptional. Moreover, the pope appointed the inquisitor whom the Senate classed as an officer of the State by granting him a "provision" or salary; and the extent of his influence on the "learned in heresy" depended entirely on the Roman Curia's influence over the Senate itself.

4. France.

In France the Inquisition's most appalling operation began in the thirteenth century (see New Manicheans, II.; Innocent III.), and did not reach an end with the annihilation of the Albigenses. The people endured the yoke with extreme reluctance; in 1242 a desperately goaded multitude assailed the inquisitors in the territory of Avignon. (Those then slain were canonized by Pius IX. in Sept., 1866; and he did the same thing, in the year following, for the atrocious Spanish inquisitor, Pedro Arbues.) The attitude of the French kings to the Inquisition shows various phases. Louis IX. (Saint Louis) promulgated a mandate in 1228 which binds the temporal sovereignty to unconditional collaboration with the Inquisition; on the other hand, Philip the Fair decreed, in 1290, that due circumspection should be observed in the matter of arresting alleged heretics. The violent reactions of the tortured people and various royal edicts had at last their effect; and in time the complete revolution brought forth by the Great Schism and the growing independence of the French nation made an end of the Inquisition in France sooner than in other lands.

5. Spain.

Meanwhile the Inquisition in Spain blossomed out with peculiar fulness. It is, to be sure, an error to ascribe to it, with Hefele (*Cardinal Ximenez*, Tübingen, 1844) and Ranke, the character of a royal court of justice; for, as the Jesuits Grisar and Orti y Lara prove, it is altogether ecclesiastical, having only certain special state privileges and a certain influence being allowed the king in the choice of inquisitors. It developed from the thirteenth century, on the background of persecution of Moors and Jews. Prior to the sixteenth century, its principal operation was against the Maranos or alleged converts from Judaism to Christianity. The inquisitor-general, Tomas de Torquemada (q.v.), appointed by Pope Sixtus IV., outdid all precedents in the way of executions and confiscations; it was under him, in Saragossa, that Arbues came to his bloody end. To say naught of the fact that the national character was favorable to it, the Spanish Inquisition underwent a peculiar development on three sides: in the first place, it had a royally acknowledged head in the inquisitor-general; in the second place, under the inquisitor-general, the *Consejo de la suprema* acted uniformly for all Spain, with assistance from the state authorities; in the third place, while the king's influence on the tribunal was undoubtedly large, it was never exerted against the interests of the Church—on the contrary, the presence of the king or of his representative at the *autos da fé* imparted to these the quality of great spectacles authorized by the State, almost popular festivals. It is impossible to estimate the number of the victims. Llorente's data are questioned, and may be disregarded. However, from the Inquisitor Paramo's treatise *De origine et progressu inquisitionis* (Madrid, 1598), p. 140, it appears that in forty years (1480–1520), at Seville, 4,000 were burned, and 30,000 "penitents" were sentenced to various penalties.

6. Germany, the Netherlands, and England.

In Germany, Conrad of Marburg (q.v.) was to bring the institution to its flower. But the wrath of the people slew him and his assistant, Droso, just as their activity began to ripen (1233). Hence in Germany the Inquisition, for the most part, failed to attain to thoroughgoing activity. Nevertheless, until the fifteenth century a good many instances of separate procedures occur. The acts collected by Frédéricq show what was ordained for Germany and the Netherlands in common. This author gives the directions of Gregory IX., addressed to the bishops, in 1233, to the effect that they shall catch the "little foxes"—that is, the heretics ostensibly converted; while a whole series of similar ordinances ensues to the time of the bull *Summis desiderantes* in 1484, by the terms of which the special activity of the Inquisition was directed against Witchcraft (q.v.). It was furthermore directed against the "Waldenses" along the Rhine, in Bavaria and Austria, in Bohemia, and as far as the mark of Brandenburg and Pomerania, as well as against sects of every kind in the Netherlands. It had waged a fearful war of extermination in North Germany, in the district of Bremen, 1233, against the Stedingi (q.v.). From the exact information in Frédéricq's work, it appears that the extent of the bloody doings at Antwerp, Brussels, Ghent, Utrecht, and other cities was greater than previously known. During the period before the Reformation, England was less affected by the Inquisition. It first became active against the Lollards (q.v.). In 1401 Henry IV. had parliament confirm the statute *De hæretico comburendo.*

1. The Reformation Suppressed in Italy.

III. The Inquisition and the Counter-Reformation: In 1542 Cardinal Caraffa, subsequently Pope Paul IV., reorganized the Roman Inquisition after the pattern of the Spanish. He himself assumed the direction of the Holy Office created by the bull *Licet ab initio.* The executive procedure was to be centralized at Rome, primarily for all Italy; and the outcome was to be guaranteed by uniform, ruthless, and swift operation. The new organization, having at its disposal the entire influence of the Roman Curia over every state of Italy, by the time of Pius V. had made an end of the Reformation in that country (see Italy, the Reformation in); its advocates were either incarcerated or killed, or driven to flight, while literary products were sought out and destroyed, save insignificant remnants. As an example of the Inquisition's operation in Italy, its actions against "Lutherans" or other heretics in Venice may be enumerated: in the sixteenth century, according to the acts still preserved in the state archives, there were 803 trials for "Lutheranism"; five for "Calvinism"; thirty-five for Anabaptism; forty-three for relapse of converts into Judaism; sixty-five for blasphemous speeches; 148 for sorcery; forty-five for contempt of religion (that is, of ecclesiastical ceremonies, etc.); and more of the sort. Later these figures notably vanish. Branches of the new Roman office were organized in all other cities of Italy, Naples excepted. Rome, however, continued the center; and how numerous the trials conducted at that place must have been appears from the circumstance that the single protocol-book accessible records during the three years 1564–67 no fewer than 111 sentences, all involving severe punishment, some the death penalty, and some imprisonment for life.

2. In Spain and the Netherlands.

As in Italy, so in Spain, the reformatory movement of the sixteenth century fell a prey to the Inquisition (see Spain, Reformation Movements of Sixteenth Century in). At Seville and Valladolid the movement was crushed and obliterated in the course of four *autos da fé*, 1559 and 1560 (cf. E. Schäfer, *Sevilla und Valladolid, die evangelischen Gemeinden Spaniens im Reformationszeitalter*, Halle, 1903); and the Inquisition still flourished in all the land until 1700; according to Llorente, 782 more autos occurred under the first Bourbons (1700–46), wherein 14,000 persons were subjected to heavier or lighter penalties. Indeed, Ferdinand VII. restored the Inquisition along with the Restoration in 1814; but it was finally set aside in 1834. The Inquisition persisted long also in Portugal, where it was mainly directed against the Jews; it came to an end there in 1826. In the imperial Netherlands, the Inquisition effectively combated the Reformation in the sixteenth century. From Brussels as a center, it was so actively conducted, or supported, from 1522 downward by the officials of Charles V., then by the two stadtholder princesses, that by 1530 its goal seemed achieved. The spirit, however, it could not subdue, and it raged afresh under Philip II., and anticipated the cruel deeds of Alva. When eventually the north provinces conquered their religious and political freedom, the Inquisition had annihilated the Reformation in the south provinces. Its activity was also carried into the Spanish possessions in America, and into the East Indies by the Portuguese.

The *Congregatio sanctae Romanae et universalis inquisitionis* is still maintained by the Curia; and the estimate which Rome puts on the institution appeared in 1867 in the canonization of Pedro Arbues, and in 1869 in the constitution *Apostolicae*, which threatens penalty for every infraction of the Inquisition's activity. Not one of all the regulations which define its action and determine its aims has been repealed.

K. Benrath.

Bibliography: In the first rank as a source is the *Directorium* of Eymerich, written at Avignon as a manual of procedure in 1376, edited by Pegna, Rome, 1580, cf. P. H. Denifle in *Archiv für Litteratur- und Kirchengeschichte*, 1885, p. 10. The *Liber sententiarum inquisitionis Tholosanæ* is reproduced as an addition to P. van Limborch, *Historia Inquisitionis*, Amsterdam, 1692, Eng. transl., London, 1731, often abbreviated and republished in England and America. The *Practica Inquisitionis* of Bernard Guidonis, ed. C. Douais, appeared Paris, 1886. The best collection of sources for the Netherlands is gathered in P. Frédéricq, *Corpus documentorum Inquisitionis*, 2 vols., The Hague, 1889–96. Early material on Spain and Italy respectively is included in J. A. Llorente, *Historia critica de la Inquisicion de España*, 10 vols., Madrid, 1822, abridged Eng. transl., *Hist. of the Inquisition of Spain from the Time of the Establishment to the Reign of Ferdinand VII.*, London, 1826, and in E. C. Comba, *I nostri Protestanti*, vol. ii., Florence, 1897. An index to some sources is found in *Catalogue of a Collection of Manuscripts formerly belonging to the Holy Office . . . in the Canary Islands*, 1499–1693, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1903.

On the general history of the Inquisition the best work is H. C. Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages*, revised ed., 3 vols., New York, 1906–07. Consult further: J. Marsollier, *Hist. de l'inquisition dès son origine*, Cologne, 1693; W. H. Rule, *Hist. of the Inquisition in Every Country where its Tribunals have been Established*, London, 1874; Orti y Lara, *La Inquisizion*, Madrid, 1877; J. Havet, *L'Hérésie et le bras séculier*, Paris, 1881; A. Henner, *Beiträge zur Organisation der päpstlichen Ketzergerichte*, Leipsic, 1890; J. Hansen, *Zauberwesen, Inquisition und Hexenprozess im Mittelalter*, Munich, 1900; P. von Hoensbroech, *Das Papsttum ins social-kulturellen Wirksamkeit*, vol. i., Leipsic, 1900; C. V. Langlois, *L'Inquisition d'après des travaux récents*, Paris, 1902; E. Schäfer, *Beiträge zur Geschichte . . . der Inquisition*, 3 vols., Gütersloh, 1902; C. Douais, *L'Inquisition, se sorigines, sa procédure*, Paris, 1906; E. Vacandard, *L'Inquisition; . . . le pouvoir coercitif de l'église*, ib. 1906, Eng. transl., *Critical and Historical Study of the Coercive Power of the Church*, London, 1908; T. de Cauzons, *Les Albigeois et l'inquisition, les Vaudois et l'inquisition*, 2 vols., Paris, 1907; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 1, pp. 515 sqq.; the literature under New Manicheans and in general the treatises on Church history.

For the institution in France, consult: C. Molinier, *L'Inquisition dans le midi de la France*, Paris, 1881; W. Esmein, *Hist. . . . de la procédure inquisitoire*, ib. 1882; L. Tanon, *Hist. de l'inquisition en France*, ib. 1893; T. de Cauzons, *Hist. de l'inquisition en France;* vol. i., *Les Origines*, Paris, 1909. For Germany consult: H. Haupt, *Waldenserthum und Inquisition im süd-östlichen Deutschland*, Freiburg, 1890; P. Flade, *Das römische Inquisitionsverfahren in Deutschland*, Berlin, 1902. For the Netherlands: W. Moll, *Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland*, ii., chap. 16, Utrecht, 1869; J. G. de Hoop-Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der Kerkhervorming in Nederland*, Amsterdam, 1873; P. Claessens, *L'Inquisition dans les Pays-Bas*, Turnhout, 1886; P. Frédéricq, *Geschiedenis der Inquisitie in de Nederlanden*, 2 vols., Ghent, 1892–97; J. Frederichs, *Twe Verhandelingen over de Inquisitie in de Nederlanden*, The Hague, 1897. For Italy: L. Witte, *A Glance at the Italian Inquisition*, London, 1885; L. Amabile, *Il Santo Officio della Inquisizione in Napoli*, 2 vols., Citta di Castello, 1892. For Spain: H. C. Lea, *The Inquisition in Spain*, 4 vols., New York, 1906–07; idem, *The Inquisition in the Spanish Dependencies*, ib. 1908; idem, *Chapters from the Hist. of Spain connected with the Inquisition*, Philadelphia, 1890; É. de Molènes, *Torquemada et l'inquisition*, Paris, 1897; C. J. von Hefele, *Life and Times of Cardinal Ximenez*, London, 1885. For South America: B. V. Mackenna, *Francesco Moyen; or, the Inquisition as it was in America*, London, 1869. J. T. Medina has written a number of volumes in Spanish, on the Inquisition in Lima, Santiago, 1887; in Chile, 3 vols., ib. 1890; in Cartagena, ib. 1899; in De la Plata, ib. 1899; in the Philippines, ib. 1899; and in Mexico, ib. 1905.

INSABATATI (SABOTIERS): A name given to the Waldenses (q.v.) from their sabots, marked with a painted cross, or from the sandals tied crosswise.

INSCRIPTIONS.

I. Egyptian Inscriptions.
  Forms and Character (§ 1).
  Number, Age, and Contents (§ 2).
  The Rosetta Stone and Decipherment (§ 3).
  Illustration of the Bible (§ 4).
II. Cuneiform Inscriptions.
  The Name; Area Covered by the Script (§ 1).
  Discoveries; Decipherment of Persian (§ 2).
  Decipherment of Babylonian-Assyrian (§ 3).
  Origin and Character of the Script (§ 4).
III. Christian Inscriptions.
  1. Ancient Christian Inscriptions.
    Methods of Writing (§ 1).
    Languages Employed (§ 2).
    Contents (§ 3).
    Value of the Material (§ 4).
  2. Medieval and Later Inscriptions.
  3. History of Epigraphy.
    The Early Period (§ 1).
    The Nineteenth Century (§ 2).

1. Forms and Character.

I. Egyptian Inscriptions: The inscriptions of Egypt are no new discovery. The term most used to describe the characters employed in the inscriptions, "hieroglyphics," is of Greek origin (*hieros*, "sacred" + *glyphein*, "to carve") and bears witness both to early knowledge of the existence of the writing and to the conception at that time that the priestly class was its executor. In more modern usage the term is not confined to the Egyptian inscriptions, but is used generally of any kind of picture-writing. The inscriptions on the monuments of Egypt are in the main in a picture-writing, the individual signs of which are representations of objects or actions more or less conventionalized. This detailed representation passed by the method of abbreviation into a shorter form called the hieratic script, and by the extension of this process to a still shorter form, the demotic. But in only the very late period of Egyptian history was either the hieratic or demotic form employed upon the monuments, though both were used on papyri from an early age. While originally the signs stood for the objects they pictured, at a very early stage they came to have phonetic quality, and from this to the development of an alphabet the steps were rapid and easy. While this process was going on, the signs were given values associated with those already customary and also others disconnected from the original connotation. The alphabet was of twenty-one letters (some authorities say twenty-two, others twenty-four), all consonants, though some of the letters were employed to indicate vowel sounds, as in the Semitic languages. The signs became also signs of syllables as well as of single letters, and, still further, signs of words or ideographs. In all, the number of symbols known from the monuments is slightly under 1,400. Since some of these symbols might express several ideas, it became necessary to use certain signs as determinatives to fix the meaning of the group in which they occurred, thus to remove ambiguity. The signs composing a word or idea are grouped in quadrangular form, though the order of grouping is not invariable, being either perpendicular or horizontal, according to the shape of the components, the exigencies of the space at disposal or the artistic taste of the scribe. The groups were arranged in columns or in lines, according to the material used and the space and form available for the inscription. The writing runs either (preferably) from right to left or the reverse when arranged horizontally, or from above downward when it is in columns.

2. Number, Age, and Contents.

The area within which these inscriptions are found embraces the whole of the Nile valley as far as Nubia, parts of the peninsula of Sinai, and locations in Syria and Palestine. Records begin with the second dynasty; during the fourth, fifth and sixth dynasties they become numerous, though largely centralized around Memphis; then they become fewer until with the eleventh dynasty they again grow abundant and spread out over a wide area, continuing numerous till the fourteenth dynasty. Of the Hyksos kings few remains are found. With the seventeenth dynasty inscriptions once more become abundant and continue so, with exceptions in some dynasties or single reigns, till down into Roman times. The inscriptions were placed on the walls of temples, on stelæ and monuments set up within the temple courts, on obelisks, and in tombs both of the Pharaohs and of the nobility and the wealthier classes, and on gems, rings, and scarabs. Since the temples of the earlier period have vanished, it follows that the inscriptions of those times have for the most part perished. Yet while some of the earliest monuments were destroyed at a very early date, it sometimes occurs that the record which they bore was copied on a more perishable material which has survived. A matter which often causes embarrassment to the decipherer is that it was the known habit of some Pharaohs, as in the case of Rameses II., to remove the royal name in the cartouche of the original Pharaoh who ordered the inscription, and to inscribe their own in its place, thus claiming the deeds originally assigned to another and dislocating the order of history. The earliest inscriptions come from massive masonry tombs, where often little more than names, titles, and, sometimes, the legal provisions for maintenance of the tomb are preserved. Later, in addition to these bare statements, the lists of titles are extended to include something of the career of the deceased. Finally they contain records of achievement—whether of Pharaohs, generals, or administrators—of the occasion which the record commemorates, and may even include the royal patent for the work of which the inscription speaks. But, in general, a vagueness characterizes the content of the inscriptions and makes them illusive and difficult, not only in themselves but also in the historical matter to which they refer. Thus, in a story of conquest, the foe is often referred to not by name or country, but is described by some derogatory epithet: again, the events narrated were often contemporary and matters of general knowledge; it therefore did not seem to the maker necessary to give specific details, so that the identification of the events is often doubtful or impossible. Not seldom, the inscriptions are mere laudations of the Pharaoh, or, again, are hymns in praise of him. Others are records of building enterprises, giving the personal history of the ruler or administrator. Decrees of administration appear. In private tombs records of filial performance in the maintenance of the tomb occur, and there are also found interesting accounts referring to wars or enterprises otherwise unknown. The longest inscriptions are the Pyramid texts of the Pharaohs of the fifth and sixth dynasties, discovered in 1880, dealing largely with matters religious, including magic. The Palermo Stone is one of the most noted monuments—a fragment of a stele containing a record of pre-dynastic kings, continuing to the middle of the fifth dynasty, and giving brief royal annals. The various erections at Karnak afforded space for voluminous inscriptions, to some of which reference must be made later.

3. The Rosetta Stone and Decipherment.

Since the fifteenth century attempts were made to decipher the Egyptian hieroglyphics, though without success till the early part of the nineteenth century. But meanwhile a foundation was laid for a broader and sounder appreciation of Egyptian archeology by the work done on Coptic since the time of Athanasius Kircher, who published the first Coptic grammar (Rome, 1643–44). The epoch-making work of Champollion (see below) was in no small part due to his mastery of Coptic. But all attempts to read the hieroglyphics were complete failures until the key was furnished by the Rosetta Stone. This is a slab of black granite, three feet nine inches by two feet four and a half inches and eleven inches thick, bearing an inscription in hieroglyphic and demotic Egyptian and in Greek. It was found in 1799 by M. Boussard, a French military officer, at Fort St. Julien, near Rosetta, on the Rosetta branch of the Nile (40 m. n.e. of Alexandria), was taken to England after the fall of Alexandria, and was presented to the British Museum by George III. (1801). The upper portion and the lower right-hand corner are broken away. It contains a decree of the Egyptian priests in honor of Ptolemy V. Epiphanes (205–181 B.C.), and its date is Mar. 27, 195 B.C. It bears 100 lines of text, fourteen of hieroglyphic (about half of the original), thirty-two of demotic, and fifty-four of Greek (the ends of some of the lines broken off). Its significance is not in its contents, but in the fact that it proved to be the key to the decipherment of the hieroglyphic and demotic writing, and consequently opened up nearly all that is known of and through Egyptian texts. The results gained through the decipherment of this text were checked and confirmed by the trilingual stele of Canopus found by Lepsius at Tanis in 1866, containing a similar decree of the year 238 B.C., in honor of Ptolemy III. Euergetes I. (247–222 B.C.). Yet the process of decipherment was somewhat tedious. Sylvestre de Sacy (1802) detected several groups in the demotic text which corresponded to the Greek forms of the names Ptolemy, Berenice, and Alexander. The Swede J. D. Akerblad (1802) obtained the phonetic values of most of the demotic characters in the proper names and used the Coptic to determine the meaning of several words. Thomas Young (1814), an English scientist, determined the meanings of several groups of demotic characters and established four alphabetical hieroglyphic characters. Jean François Champollion put the crown upon all these efforts by reading from a bilingual obelisk in Philæ, in hieroglyphic and Greek, the names of Ptolemy and Cleopatra, deciphering the names of Greek and Roman rulers, making out all the characters, discovering ideograms and determinatives, gaining insight into the phonetic system, and discerning the relations of the three kinds of script. He made a statement of his discoveries and expounded his system to the Académie des Inscriptions, Sept. 22, 1822. Karl Richard Lepsius worked on the lines of Champollion and corrected some mistakes, but proved the general soundness of Champollion's conclusions against the captious and envious criticism of several German writers. The science of Egyptology has been advanced by many later scholars, such as, to name only a few, Emmanuel de Rougé, Auguste Mariette, Paul Pierret, Jacques de Morgan and Gaston Maspero in France, Heinrich Brugsch, Alfred Wiedemann, Georg Ebers, Adolf Erman and Georg Steindorff in Germany, John Gardner Wilkinson, Samuel Birch, Peter le Page Renouf, Edward Naville, Ernest Alfred Thompson, Wallis Budge, and William Matthew Flinders-Petrie in England, W. Max Müller and James Henry Breasted in the United States.

4. Illustration of the Bible.

The scantiness of illustration of Biblical history afforded by the Egyptian monuments as compared with the abundance gained from the Assyro-Babylonian records has been to many a cause of great disappointment. The explanation of this scantiness is, however, not hard to discover. One reason is the vagueness of Egyptian records (see above). Another, which is on the surface, is that after the Hebrews settled in Palestine contact of Egypt with Palestine was occasional and not always of such a character as to dispose the monument-makers to speak of it—they recorded only victories, not failures or defeats. That mention of the Hebrews who had broken away from Egyptian control would appear in the inscriptions was hardly to be expected, nor that pre-Mosaic Israel would be differentiated from the numerous nomads of Semitic stock who occasionally sought refuge in the Nile land. Accordingly, apart from that general illustration of manners of living which is a consequence of a sort of commonality of life in the East, little of specific detail need be looked for from the Egyptian inscriptions either corroborating or contradicting Biblical statements, especially if, according to the view now generally accepted, the Hebrews were very few in numbers. What little specific illustration there is takes on either a geographical or ethnological character. The first comes through the mention of places conquered in Palestine by the Pharaohs. Thothmes III. (eighteenth dynasty), who made fifteen expeditions into Syria and Palestine, has recorded in the temple of Amon at Karnak, on the wall of the southern pylon and on the northern wall at the western end of the temple, a list of places in that region the submission of which he claims to have received (cf. *Records of the Past*, new series, v. 29–53, for the list of names). Noteworthy and productive of a vast amount of discussion are the names *Yaḳob-el* and *Yosep-el*, which seem to represent an early form of the names Jacob and Joseph. The real significance of these names, paralleled from the cuneiform inscriptions, is as yet under debate, but eponymous derivation seems to be favored. The geography is also illuminated by the lists of Seti I. and Rameses II. (nineteenth dynasty), the latter's inscriptions on the Ramesseum at Thebes and at Karnak, and by that of Rameses III. at Medinet Haba.

Shishak I. (twenty-second dynasty) also furnished on the south wall of the great temple at Karnak a list of geographical names in which there are 156 cartouches, not all legible (cf. W. M. Müller, *Asien und Europa*, Leipsic, 1893, pp. 166 sqq.).

The monuments of Seti I., Rameses II. and IV., and Meneptah contain references which are thought by the advanced school to bear on pre-Mosaic history. That the *Aperiu* (cf. Heb. *'Ibhri*, "Hebrew" and the *Ḥabiri* of the Amarna Tablets, q.v.) were Hebrews is not yet assured, though it is possible. Seti I. and Rameses II. speak of an *Aseru* or *Asaru* in western Galilee in the region assigned to the tribe Asher in the Hebrew records (Judges v. 17, cf. i. 32). Of this alternative explanations are given: the Asherites were a Canaanitic tribe absorbed later into the Hebrew confederation (which would go with the assumed eponymous derivation of the name and with the Biblical account of descent from a concubine) or the Hebrews who settled in the region took the name of the country (W. M. Müller, ut sup. pp. 236–239). On a stele of Meneptah discovered in 1895 occurs the only known mention of Israel on the Egyptian monuments (in the form *I-si-r-'l*) as a people whom Meneptah had reduced. This mention is complicated by the fact that Meneptah is now quite generally regarded as the Pharaoh of the Exodus; how, then, could Israel be in Palestine during his reign? Accordingly many commentators are disposed to see in the Israel of Meneptah's inscription a part of the Hebrews settled in Palestine who did not go down into Egypt and gave their name to the confederation in later times; these commentators regard as confirmation of this the occurrence of *Yaḳob-el* and *Yosep-el* (ut sup.). Light on the Exodus of the Hebrews comes not from the hieroglyphic, but from a combination of a Greco-Roman inscription with the identification of Succoth and Pithom through indications in the Coptic version of the Old Testament and through indications in Greek writers (see Egypt). While the bearing of Egyptian inscriptions on Hebrew history and ethnology is thus vague and indecisive, if it has any value at all it is in the way of strengthening the case of the newer school of constructive history. Geo. W. Gilmore.

1. The Name; Area Covered by the Script.

II. Cuneiform Inscriptions: Cuneiform, from the Latin *cuneus*, "wedge," was first applied in the year 1700 by Thomas Hyde, professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford. In that day Hyde was acquainted only with some rude copies of Assyrian characters, and with some equally rude copies of Sassanian and Palmyrene inscriptions, concerning which he argued that they were not letters, nor intended for letters, but were mere ornament. Later investigation has shown that the cuneiform method of writing is one of the oldest known to man and one of the most widely diffused, and that it sufficed for more than five thousand years to express the ideas of nearly a score of peoples, among whom were some of the greatest culture races of antiquity. It was invented by the pre-Semitic Sumerian inhabitants of Babylonia, was adopted by their conquerors, the Semitic Babylonians, and thence carried to Assyria. It was besides diffused among all the neighboring peoples and came into use as far east as Elam and as far west as Egypt (see Amarna Tablets).

2. Discoveries; Decipherment of Persian.

The first modern observer of cuneiform characters was Pietro della Valle, about 1618 A.D., who copied from the ruins of Persepolis in Persia a few characters in random but fairly accurate fashion. The material thus provided was too scanty to stimulate any earnest effort at decipherment. The first opportunity afforded European scholars for study of the cuneiform was given in 1774 by Carsten Niebuhr, a Dane, father of the famous Roman historian, who had copied at Persepolis a number of small inscriptions, grouped in threes upon the remains of the palaces of the Achamenian kings. Previous travelers had expressed the opinion that three languages were represented in these Persepolis texts, and later study has shown the three languages to be Persian, Susian, and Assyro-Babylonian. The task of decipherment was rendered difficult by the fact that no bilingual inscription was found in which a known language occurred. The method of decipherment was to be archeological rather than philological, and the process was necessarily slow and insecure. The first efforts in decipherment of the Persian inscriptions—the simplest in each group of three—put forth by Friedrich Christian Karl Heinrich Münter and Olaf Tychsen seemed to show that these texts contained only forty-two signs, which were therefore mainly alphabetic with some syllabic values, but only a few correct values for the signs were determined. The first decipherment of an entire text was made by George Frederick Grotefend, who was almost continuously engaged upon decipherment from 1802 until 1844. The facts with which he began were that these texts came from Persepolis, and that the ruins there were the remains of palaces erected by Cyrus, Darius, and Xerxes. He assumed, consequently, that each text began with the name of a king, and his success was achieved by comparison of two inscriptions, which Grotefend finally translated as follows: "I. Darius, the mighty king, king of kings . . . son of Hystaspes. II. Xerxes, the mighty king, king of kings . . . son of Darius, the king." This result was small in itself, but it afforded the clue for the decipherment of several languages, besides the three found at Persepolis. At the same time that Grotefend was engaged in this task, Major (afterward Sir) Henry Rawlinson was trying to reach a solution and in the same way. Quite independently of Grotefend he worked out some of the sign values, and, when later provided with Grotefend's results, far surpassed him in the power to translate Persian inscriptions. He discovered the great rock-cut inscription of Darius at Behistun in Persia, which he copied, laboriously and successfully deciphered, and published in an English translation, nearly complete, in the year 1846.

3. Decipherment of Babylonian-Assyrian.

The decipherment of Persian was followed by a determined attempt to solve the far more difficult problem of the Assyro-Babylonian cuneiform script, in which the third inscription in these groups of three was written. The first to attempt it was Grotefend, who identified the names of the kings, but was unable to go much further. Isidor Loewenstein secured the correct meanings of the signs for "king," "great," and the sign for the plural. He first suggested that Assyrian belonged to the Semitic family and was therefore related to Hebrew, Arabic and Aramean. Far more successful was the Rev. Edward Hincks (q.v.), who, in two papers during 1846 and a third in 1847, determined most of the numerals, assigned correct values to a number of signs, and seemed on the very verge of being able to read a whole text. His rigidly scientific spirit, however, restrained him from such an endeavor, and he worked steadily on with the patient solution of one difficulty at a time. When the immense mass of cuneiform documents which Emil Botta had discovered at Nineveh reached Paris, the hope of deciphering Assyrian increased because of the accession of material, but diminished when Botta pointed out the great difficulty of the problem. He made little effort to decipher or translate, but collated all the inscriptions which they contained and made lists of all the signs which he found, differentiating 642 separate signs. This great number proved that the Assyrian cuneiform script was not alphabetic; some of the characters must be syllabic, some must be ideographs and represent a word or an idea. Botta's discoveries were carried further by Edward Hincks. In a paper read before the Irish Academy on June 25, 1849, he showed that there was a sign for RA, another for RI, and yet another for RU. He proved the sign for AR, and presumably also for IR and UR, though he did not fully define the last two. This represented a great advance in the study of the problem. Rawlinson soon dared to do what Hincks would not, and ventured to translate the great Behistun text. There was needed then only the minute study of the characters until the entire syllabic system with its polyphones and ideographs should yield up its secrets. To this not only Rawlinson, but in even greater degree Hincks, contributed, and also the distinguished French Assyriologist, Jules Oppert. Contemporaneously with the decipherment of Assyrian went forward the decipherment of the Susian, or second language of the groups of three found at Persepolis. In this work the chief leaders were Niels Ludwig Westergaard, Hincks, Félicien Caignart de Saulcy, and Archibald Henry Sayce. When Persian, Susian, and Assyrian (or Babylonian) had been deciphered, the foundations of the new science of Assyriology had been laid.

4. Origin and Character of the Script.

The cuneiform method of writing originated among the Sumerians, the earliest known inhabitants of Babylonia. When the Semites entered the land they found in possession a round-headed people, of small stature and with black hair, whose origin and racial connections are unknown. A small though learned company of scholars has maintained that the supposed Sumerians had no existence, and that their script, civilization and religion were all originated by Semites. This view has lost support, and can hardly be longer regarded as seriously disputing the current view as stated above. The cuneiform characters were originally a form of picture-writing. At first the pictures represented natural objects; they then became associated with certain words, and were used phonetically to represent the sound of the words without the meaning. In very early times, these rude pictures were scratched on any material that came to hand. Later stone was used for permanent records. But as stone is scarce in Babylonia, the easily worked clay took its place, and the straight lines made by a single pressure on the stylus tended to become wedges. The pictures therefore lost their original character and gradually became groups of wedges which were so thoroughly conventionalized that it is now impossible to determine their origin save in a very few cases. Even to the Assyrians themselves the original form of but very few characters was known, though a few tablets still preserved (cf. *TSBA*, vi. 454 and *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in British Museum*, part v., London, 1898) show that the Assyrians retained a consciousness of the pictorial origin of their script. The Assyrians never developed a consonantal alphabet. They had only a syllabary, with separate signs for the vowels *a*, *i* or *e*, and *u*. The syllabic signs consisted, in the first instance, of a separate sign for each consonant with each separate vowel, thus, *ab*, *ib*, *ub*, *ba*, *bi*, *bu*, *ag*, *ig*, *ug*, *ga*, *gi*, *gu*, the former serving also for *ap*, *ip*, *up*, etc. In addition to these simple syllables, the script had a large number of compound signs, such as *bal*, *bil*, *kak*, *man*, *kun*, etc. There were also very many ideograms, a sign being used as the symbol for a whole idea; thus there was a single sign for *ilu*, "god," *belu*, "lord," *aplu*, "son," *duppu*, "tablet," *umu*, "day." Difficulties are further increased by the fact that many signs are polyphonous; a single sign may have several syllabic values, and besides may stand as an ideogram for several ideas. The difficulties were somewhat lessened by the use of signs called determinatives placed before a word to show the class to which it belonged. ROBERT W. ROGERS.

III. Christian Inscriptions: By Christian inscriptions in this article are meant non-literary writings executed or provided by Christians which have some relation to the Christian religion. Christian epigraphy is concerned with inscriptions carved, scratched, painted, or stamped on various materials, such as stone, metal, clay, ivory, and wood, intended to designate the source or purpose of an object, and also with documents which, on account of general or permanent interest, are inscribed on durable material, usually stone or metal. This comparatively new science has hitherto devoted its attention chiefly to the days of the early Church, but it is hoped that more attention will be paid to the collection and study of medieval and later inscriptions which are in danger of perishing with the lapse of time.

1. Methods of Writing.

1. Ancient Christian Inscriptions: (1) Letters and figures. The workmen who made the earliest Christian inscriptions adopted the letters and numeral system of their predecessors, which was already old, and continued its development steadily, except in cases of deliberate archaism. Thus by degrees new forms arose, more slowly in some places than in others, and usually later in the provinces than in Rome. At the date of the earliest Christian inscriptions, there were three principal types of characters: one used for carving on stone or metal, one for painting on walls or woodwork, which corresponded to that inscribed on parchment or papyrus, and the vulgar or cursive script, which was either impressed on soft material such as wax, fresh clay, or plaster, or scratched on a hard surface, especially walls (the so-called *graffito*). These three types were not always sharply distinguished, and Christian epigraphy shows examples that can with difficulty be assigned to any of the three classes, and others in which the forms appear in a confused mixture—sometimes even one half of a letter being in monumental and the other half in painter's script. The most important class of letters, in the Christian as in the older pagan inscriptions, is the capitals, including the largest number of symbols for letters and numbers. Besides these there were the uncial forms, developed from the capitals by the rounding off of sharp angles, and the cursive form, which sought for speed in writing by using as few separate strokes as possible. This last form occurs among the dated inscriptions in Rome as early as 291. (2) Ligatures. In the formation of words the letters are sometimes separate, sometimes two or more are united into a single symbol. These ligatures were originally peculiar to coins, where the limited space made them useful, and then were adopted in inscriptions. The rule for reading them was that each element entering into their composition was to be read only once. From the ligatures developed the monogrammatic signs, which continued even in the Middle Ages to be employed for imperial signatures and the like. (3) Abbreviations. The words may be either written in full or abbreviated, sometimes to a single letter. The omission of letters is indicated by strokes or projections above, below, or beside the letters, or by periods and other signs following them. Connected with these signs are the strokes frequently, though not invariably, placed over numbers to distinguish them from ordinary letters. (4) Punctuation. A large number of various punctuation-marks were used. The commonest is the period, usually written, not on the line, but half-way up the letters; its shape is generally round or approximately so; sometimes it is represented by a small circle, and less often by two sides of a triangle in various positions. Out of this latter form developed leaves, somewhat like ivy-leaves, which used to be considered as intended for pierced hearts, and thus as signs of martyrdom. Occasionally the Greek cross, or even the Chi Rho, is used as a punctuation-mark. It was the rule in the classical period to place punctuation-marks only within lines, not at the end, but in many Christian monuments this rule is not observed; indeed, in many the entire system of punctuation is irregular, points being placed even in the middle of words—though this is to be distinguished from "syllabic punctuation," where the syllables were divided to facilitate reading. (5) Direction of the writing. Writing from right to left had become very rare among the Greeks and Romans at the date of the earliest Christian inscriptions, and only a few instances of it occur among them. While no certain example of the ancient boustrophedon form is known, there are a number which are read downward, and arrangements still less usual exist, dictated sometimes by the shape of the space at command, but in other cases probably by nothing more than a love of singularity.

2. Languages Employed.

The great majority of extant early Christian inscriptions are in Latin, Greek coming next. Even in the West there is a considerable number of Greek inscriptions, generally for or by people who were not Greeks, but Romans. This phenomenon finds a parallel in the fact that the earliest Christian literature was in Greek, even when the authors lived in the West. The parallel, however, must not be pressed too far, since they were educated men, while most of those to whom the inscriptions are due belonged to the lower classes. The number of Greek inscriptions, even in Rome, is to be explained by the fact that in the primitive Church Greek was the official language. All the third-century popes who are buried in the catacombs of St. Calixtus have Greek inscriptions, while Cornelius, whose grave is in his family burying-ground, has a Latin one. The mixture of Greek and Latin in a number of inscriptions is probably due less to defective education than to an instinctive opposition in people's minds to the use of a language which was really foreign to them. An interesting light is thus thrown upon the final struggle of the two languages in the West, beginning while Greek was still the ecclesiastical tongue. After the second century Greek inscriptions and those showing a mixture of Greek and Latin become increasingly rare, and Pope Damasus uses nothing but Latin. The linguistic qualities of the inscriptions deserve careful study as giving an insight which cannot be obtained from literature into the speech of the common people. While departures from classical orthography are to be attributed partly to ignorance or carelessness, this is not so much the case with the vocabulary and the grammar, which in many of the later Latin inscriptions clearly show the transition to the Romance languages. The inscriptions are, like the pagan ones, either in prose or in verse, prose inscriptions being the more numerous, especially in the earlier period. The Hebrew language, except in the case of amulets, which are rather Jewish-pagan than Christian, is very rare; only one Christian inscription in that language has thus far been discovered in Rome.

3. Contents.

(1) To inscriptions in the narrower sense belong honorific inscriptions and a large class of eulogies of saints and martyrs, especially those of Damasus. Partly to this class and partly to the dedicatory belong numerous inscriptions on public buildings, especially churches and parts of churches, such as altars and ambones. But the largest class is composed of funeral inscriptions, on tablets, gravestones, or sarcophagi. Those on stone are usually carved or scratched, sometimes painted in addition, most often in red. Relatively few occur with the painted script, which was more often used on tiles, in red, black, and occasionally white. The wooden tablets which in Egypt Christians and non-Christians alike placed near the mummies of the departed are usually inscribed with a dark ink, or painted. Other methods are occasionally employed, such as the frequent use of mosaic in North Africa and Spain. An equally great diversity is visible in the style of the inscriptions, though a careful study reveals a more or less regular development of definite formulas. In many cases the influence of the custom and taste of the period or locality is discernible, others show traces of a conscious adherence to ancient tradition. Thus the phrase *Dis Manibus*, so frequently used on pagan tombs to dedicate them to the *manes* of the deceased, occurs in no less than 134 cases of undoubted Christian inscriptions—not, of course, with the old meaning, but merely as a traditional formula; and the same is true of the phrases *domus aeterna, aeternalis, perpetua* for the grave. Belonging also to the class of inscriptions in the narrower sense are the large number of those on objects of domestic use; but their infinite variety makes it impossible to enter upon a detailed discussion of them. (2) Of inscriptions in the broader sense (documents) the most numerous in the primitive Christian period are attestations of the purchase of a grave or agreements between the relatives of the deceased and the *fossores* or other church officials. These are sometimes exceedingly explicit, giving the names of witnesses, the purchase price, and the location of the grave. Documents expressing a gift in the giver's name become frequent in the Middle Ages, but examples are not lacking toward the end of the early period. Another class of inscriptions gives the fasts, calendars, cycles, or lists of saints; of this kind one of the most famous is the Easter cycle on the base of the statue of Hippolytus. Under this general head also come the *graffiti*, or inscriptions scratched upon the walls of the Catacombs.

4. Value of the Material.

Christian inscriptions, especially those of the early Church, deserve careful attention by students of history. While not a single original manuscript of this period is extant, and a succession of copyists has introduced a variety of difficulties into the text of literary works, the inscriptions are practically in their original shape. It has therefore long been admitted, in theory at least, that inscriptions deserve the first place among the sources for the history of their period. Again, the literature of a period is practically all the work of learned or at least well-educated men, and gives only a second-hand account of the thoughts and feelings of the populace; while the inscriptions, the majority of which come from the lower classes, present these directly and faithfully, at least in religious and ethical matters. Much valuable historical material is found in them which would have been almost or quite unknown from the literary sources. Thus the schism of Heraclius in Rome is known solely from an inscription in the catacomb of St. Calixtus, and knowledge of an African schismatic community and its head, Trigarius, is confined to the notice of another inscription. The history of the planting and earliest growth of the Church in Gaul as told by the historians is fragmentary, and a complete idea of it can be gained only from inscriptions. Until recently almost nothing was known of the history of Christianity on the islands of the Ægean in the second century; but it is now possible, on the basis of inscriptions lately discovered, not only to show the existence of Christianity there, but even to determine its nature, a mixture of Christian, Jewish, and pagan elements. A list of the writings of Hippolytus can be made complete only by the help of the inscription on the back of his statue. The frequent use of Scripture in inscriptions gives not only valuable indications of the manner in which it was employed in the early Church, but also useful points of departure for textual criticism. Not a few particulars of the marriage system are gained in the same way, especially as to the legal age, remarriage, and the marriage of clerics. The inscriptions are a more trustworthy authority for early Christian nomenclature than the manuscripts; and of course the customs connected with death and burial may be much more fully known in this way.

2. Medieval and Later Inscriptions: In the present state of inadequate investigation of this class of inscriptions it is impossible to give final conclusions as to their types of characters, language, and content. It may perhaps suffice to give some provisional observations on the results for a single country—Germany. The history of the characters employed is divided into three main periods. Speaking generally, the type known as majuscule prevailed until the fourteenth century, though with many variations. As early as the tenth century it took on the Roman form; in the eleventh and twelfth it was influenced by Romanic art, and adapted Gothic principles to its own use in the period of the latter's dominance. But the Gothic majuscule gradually gave way to the Gothic minuscule, which was the prevailing form from 1350 to 1500. In the sixteenth century, the character used in inscriptions (apart from conscious archaisms) began to be assimilated to the type of ordinary writing. As to numbers, the Roman numerals were regularly used until the fourteenth century, when the Arabic began to be common, without ever wholly excluding the older type. Ligatures are frequent in the Middle Ages, especially when the Gothic minuscules showed the tendency to do away as far as possible with spaces between the letters; but they become less usual from the sixteenth century on. Abbreviations also were very common in the Middle Ages, but later become much less usual. Punctuation was not systematic until comparatively modern times; in the Middle Ages the commonest marks were dots half-way up the letters, though crosses and other signs are occasionally used. The language employed until late in the Middle Ages was almost always Latin—seldom the vernacular, and still less often Greek or Hebrew. The Latin continued to be used on the tombs of scholars and in similar places until modern times; and the Renaissance brought in the use of Greek, especially in the sixteenth century. Medieval inscriptions, like the ancient, show many peculiarities in spelling, vocabulary and grammar.

3. History of Epigraphy: The first demonstrable collection of inscriptions is assigned to various dates within the period from 550 to 839; but a number of collections resulted from the Carolingian Renaissance, headed by the Codex Einsidlensis, the unknown author of which flourished in the eighth or early in the ninth century. These collections included both Christian and non-Christian specimens, and were made largely for the purpose of instruction in writing Latin verse. A period of inaction followed, closed by the revival of classical learning at the Renaissance. Cola Rienzi and Giovanni Dondi in the fourteenth, Ciriaco de' Pizzicolli in the fifteenth, and in the sixteenth century Felice Feliciano, Giovanni Marcanuova, Johannes Jucundus, and Petrus Sabinus were the principal collectors. Much new material was discovered in the sixteenth century, especially in the Roman catacombs, opened in 1578 by Antonio Bosio. The leading investigators of this century were Aldus Manutius the younger and Martin Smetius, while Melanchthon did not a little for the study, writing the introduction to the *Inscriptiones sacrosanctae vetustatis* of his friends Apian and Amantius (Ingolstadt, 1534), besides making independent researches of his own. The already published and newly discovered material was put together by Gruter, Scaliger, and Velser in their *Inscriptiones antiquae totius orbis Romani* (Heidelberg, 1602–03). More Christian material would have been included in Giovanni Battista Doni's *Inscriptiones antiquae* if he had lived to complete its publication, but as edited by Gori and others (Florence, 1731) a large part of this was neglected. Bosio also died (1629) before publishing the results of his labors, but they fell into better hands and appeared as *Roma sotterranea* (Rome, 1632). A supplement to Gruter's collection was published by Reinesius, a Leipsic physician (Leipsic, 1682), while Spon, Mabillon, and Montfaucon were not only working at home, but undertaking journeys outside of France for the purpose of collecting inscriptions. The eighteenth century did less for Christian epigraphy in the way of large general collections than in that of local publications and monographs, particularly by such Italian scholars as Muratori, Maffei, Zaccaria, Gori, Rivaute la Ricolvi, and De Vita.

1. The Early Period.

From the Carolingian period down into the eighteenth century Christian epigraphy was as a science far behind classical epigraphy. But the nineteenth century has quite a different story to tell. Christian inscriptions are now collected with the same care and thoroughness as the classical, a result due in the first instance to the initiative especially of August Böckh and Theodor Mommsen; and they found in Giovanni Battista de Rossi a master who elevated the study of them from a mere dilettante amusement to a serious science. After Gaetano Marini had published, in 1785, his *Iscrizioni antiche delle ville e de' palazzi Albani*, and ten years later *Gli atti e monumenti de' fratelli Arvali*, scholars looked forward eagerly to the publication of his great collection of Christian inscriptions, which now fills thirty-one volumes in the Vatican library. But he died in 1815, and none of it saw the light until, in 1831, Angelo Mai published one of the four volumes planned by him (*Nova collectio*, v.), having in some places condensed the manuscript, and in some enlarged it from his collection. But no great loss to the science was involved in the failure of the others to appear, since (apart from other defects) his classification by subjects had now been finally discredited by Böckh. The German scholar, insisting on geographical arrangement, persuaded the Berlin Academy of Sciences to take up the gigantic task of uniting in one all the Greek inscriptions. In the great *Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum* (Berlin, 1825 sqq.) some scattered Christian inscriptions appeared in the first three volumes, but the main body of them was united in the second part of Vol. IV., under the editorship of Adolf Kirchhoff. In the revised form of this great work, the parts of especial value for Christian inscriptions are that including Italy, Sicily, Gaul, Spain, Britain, and Germany (ed. Kaibel, 1890), and that on the islands of the Ægean (ed. Hiller de Gaertringen, 1895–98). A complete *Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum christianarum* is hoped for from the French School at Athens, under the direction of Laurent and Cumont. Even more than Böckh accomplished for Greek epigraphy, Mommsen did for Latin. While he was not the first to conceive the idea of a *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*, in his memorial (1847) on its plan and scope he laid down the proper lines for its execution and carried out a great part of the work himself, the rest being done by his friends and scholars. An account of new discoveries made since the appearance of the various volumes is given in the *Ephemeris epigraphica*, 1872 sqq. Until the *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum* is complete, it will still be necessary to make use of the older collections (which, indeed, will always have a value for their notes and illustrations) as well as of the works of the greatest authority in this subject west of the Vosges, Edmond Le Blant: *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule* (Paris, 1856–65); *Nouveau recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule* (1892). Long before De Rossi was requested by the Berlin Academy of Sciences to take part in the *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum* (from 1854 until his death he was one of the editors of vol. vi. on the Latin inscriptions of Rome), he had planned

2. The Nineteenth Century.

and begun preparations for a collection of the early Christian inscriptions of the city. The results appeared in the *Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores* (vol. i., Rome, 1861, vol. ii., part 1, 1888). The first volume contains the dated inscriptions, a preface which reviews the epigraphy of the past and lays down his own scheme, and extensive prolegomena, dealing especially with early Christian chronology. The first part of the second volume reproduces the manuscript collections from the so-called parchments of Scaliger down to Petrus Sabinus with admirable critical sureness and insight. Another work of like interest is the *Museo epigrafico cristiano Pio-Lateranense* (1877), containing photographic reproductions of the specimens in the lapidary gallery at the Lateran, together with noteworthy essays on various cognate subjects. Numerous other contributions to Christian epigraphy are contained in his *Roma sotterranea cristiana* (3 vols., 1864–77), in the *Bollettino d'archeologia cristiana* (1863 sqq.), and *Musaici delle chiese di Roma*, 1872–1900. Although De Rossi's enterprises were too great for accomplishment in even the longest and busiest life, they have not been allowed to drop. The continuation of the *Inscriptiones* has been placed in the hands of his old friend and faithful collaborator, Giuseppe Gatti; the (*Nuovo*) *Bollettino* has, since 1895, been edited first by De Rossi's brother Michele Stefano and his personal pupils, Stevenson, Armellini, and Marucchi, to whom have been, added, since the death of the first three, G. Bonavenia, P. Crostarosa, G. Gatti, R. Kantzler, and J. Wilpert. The completion of the *Roma sotterranea*, beginning with a fourth volume on the cemetery of Domitilla, has been undertaken by Marucchi, Wilpert, Gatti, Crostarosa, and Kantzler. For the medieval and later periods there is no single work which can be placed by the side of the *Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum* and *Latinarum*.

(Nikolaus Müller.)

Bibliography: On I., besides the literature under Egypt, much of which is pertinent, consult: J. Dümichen, *Historische Inschriften altägyptischer Denkmäler*, Leipsic, 1867–1869; idem, *Altägyptische Tempelinschriften*, ib. 1868; P. le P. Renouf, *Egyptian Phonology*, London, 1889; E. Revillout, *Cours de langue démotique*, Paris, 1883; C. Abel, *Zur Geschichte der Hieroglyphenschrift*, Leipsic, 1890; *Aegyptische Inschriften aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin*, 2 parts, Berlin, 1901–05; G. Karlberg, *Den långa . . . inskriften i Ramses III.'s tempel i Medinet-Habu*, Upsala, 1903; C. R. Honey, *The Egyptian Hieroglyph*, Boscombe, 1904; R. Weill, *Recueil des inscriptions du Sinai*, Paris, 1904; and especially numerous papers in *PSBA* and *TSBA*, in the *Memoirs* of the Egypt Exploration Fund, in *ZDMG*, *JA*, *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Alterthumskunde*, and the *Revue égyptologique*. On the Rosetta Stone consult H. Brugsch, *Die Inschrift von Rosetta*, Berlin, 1850; F. Chabas, *L'Inscription hiéroglyphique de Rosetta*, Paris, 1867; S. Sharpe, *The Rosetta Stone in Hieroglyphics and Greek*, London, 1871; J. J. Hess, *Der demotische Teil der . . . Inschrift von Rosette übersetzt*, Freiburg, 1902; E. A. T. W. Budge, *The Decrees of Memphis and Canopus*, 3 vols., London, 1904. On the Meneptah inscription consult Spiegelberg, *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1896, pp. 593 sqq.; G. Steindorff, in *ZATW*, 1896, pp. 330 sqq.; A. Wiedemann, in *Muséon*, 1898, pp. 1–19. On the relation of the inscriptions to the Bible the most sober and scientific discussion is by S. R. Driver in *Authority and Archaeology, Sacred and Profane*, ed. D. G. Hogarth, London, 1899.

II. A great deal of the literature under Assyria; Babylonia bears on the inscriptions, and some of the principal collections are named there. Consult further: R. E. Brünnow, *Classified List of All Simple and Compound Cuneiform Ideographs*, Leyden, 1889–97; P. T. Dangin, *Recherches sur l'origine de l'écriture cunéiforme*, Paris, 1898–99; F. Delitzsch, *Die Entstehung des ältesten Schriftsystems oder der Ursprung der Keilschriftzeichen*, Leipsic, 1896–98; P. Toscanne, *Les Signes sumériens dérivés*, Paris, 1905; A. V. W. Jackson, *Persia Past and Present*, New York, 1906; H. Pognon, *Inscriptions sémitiques de la Syrie, de la Mesopotamie, et de la région de Messoul*, Paris, 1907; A. H. Sayce, *The Archaeology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions*, New York, 1907. On the decipherment: R. W. Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, vol. i., New York, 1900; A. J. Booth, *The Discovery and Decipherment of the Trilingual Cuneiform Inscriptions*, London, 1902; L. Messerschmidt, *Die Entzifferung der Keilinschrift*, Berlin, 1903; C. Fossey, *Manuel d'assyriologie*, vol. i., Paris, 1904.

III. The most important literature is named in the text. A most useful article will be found in *DCA*, i., 841–862, which includes a list of the abbreviations occurring most frequently in the inscriptions and the way they are to be read. Further consult: E. le Blant, *Manuel d'épigraphie chrétienne d'après les marbres de la Gaule*, Paris, 1869; idem, *L'Epigraphie chrétienne en Gaule et dans l'Afrique romaine*, ib. 1890; J. McCaul, *Christian Epigraphs of the First Six Centuries*, London, 1869; G. Petrie, *Christian Inscriptions in the Irish Language*, ed. M. Stokes, Dublin, 1870 sqq.; J. A. Martigny, *Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes*, pp. 357 sqq., Paris, 1877; F. X. Kraus, *Roma sotterranea*, pp. 431 sqq., Freiburg, 1879; idem, *Real-Encyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer*, ii. 39 sqq., ib. 1886, V. Schultze, *Die Katakomben*, pp. 233 sqq., Leipsic, 1882; H. Otte, *Handbuch der kirchlichen Kunst-Archäologie des deutschen Mittelalters*, i., 395 sqq., ib. 1883; J. R. Allen, *Christian Symbolism in Great Britain and Ireland before the 13th Century*, London, 1888; E. Hübner, *Inscriptiones Hispaniae Christianae*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1900; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils* (for inscriptions in Great Britain) and the literature under Cemeteries, particularly that on the Catacombs given there.

INSPIRATION.

Jewish Doctrine (§ 1).
Early Christian Doctrine (§ 2).
The Scholastic Period (§ 3).
The Reformation (§ 4).
Post-Reformation Development (§ 5).
Modern Development (§ 6).
The Bible and Inspiration (§ 7).
Nature and Method of Inspiration (§ 8).
The Theory of Plenary Inspiration (§ 9).
The Theory of Partial Inspiration (§ 10).
Criteria of Inspiration (§ 11).
Modern Tendencies and Development (§ 12).

In theological language, inspiration signifies the operation of the Holy Spirit upon the writers of the Bible, by which the Bible becomes the expression of the will of God binding upon us, or the Word of God. The term originated from the Vulgate version of II Tim. iii. 16, *Omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata*. The Greek word *theopneustos*—of which it is at least doubtful whether *divinitus inspirata* is an accurate translation—belongs only to Hellenistic and Christian Greek, and may have been coined by Paul. Other post-classical uses of it show that it signifies "filled with the Spirit of God" or "breathing out the Spirit of God," from which it follows that the Scripture so designated has come into being under the operation of the Spirit. The preference of the Greek commentators for the meaning expressed by *divinitus inspirata* would have less importance if it were not explicable by the prevalent view, for which the corresponding term was thought to be found in II Tim. iii. 16, which was more or less an inheritance from Alexandrian Judaism or from paganism.

1. Jewish Doctrine.

The church doctrine—or rather the oldest views held in the Church, since it is inaccurate to speak of any distinct church doctrine on the point, either before or since the Reformation, outside of the single statement that the Scripture is inspired, without saying how it is inspired—is much closer to the Alexandrian or pagan view than to that of Jewish theology. Both Talmudic and Alexandrian Judaism agreed in attributing unique authority to the Old Testament. The Talmud claims an immediate divine origin for the "Law," asserting that God wrote it with his own hand, or dictated it to Moses as his amanuensis. A secondary revelation is contained in the "Prophets" (from Joshua on, including Psalms, Canticles, Job, Ecclesiastes, Ezra), as *Ḳabbalah*, or tradition as distinguished from the Law. In the case of the prophets, their personality is not so absorbed by the Spirit of God as to render them mere unconscious organs. The medieval Jewish theologians were the first to attribute a special kind of inspiration to the Hagiographa, as written by the spirit of holiness, while the prophetical books were written by the spirit of prophecy. Jewish antiquity knows nothing of such a distinction; and Matt. xxii. 43 shows that the origin of these books too was referred to the Spirit of God. That the personality of the authors was still more prominent in them than in the prophets may be inferred from their place in the canon, as well as from various expressions which put them, in relation to the Law, in the lowest place. Alexandrian Judaism took a different view. It is true that Josephus maintains that the Spirit was absent from the second Temple, and designates the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus as the end of canonical authorship; but he, as well as Philo and the author of Wisdom (vii. 27), believes none the less in a continuance and diffusion of the prophetic gift. Upon this theory rest the legend of the origin of the Septuagint and the acceptance of the Apocrypha. Thus, while apparently broader and freer than Talmudic Judaism, the Alexandrian school represents a doctrine of inspiration which is really much more strict. All the Old-Testament writers are prophets; but with the prophetic illumination human consciousness ceases. The prophet is merely an organ of God, who speaks through him; he knows nothing of what he is doing, and has no will of his own. He is in a state of ecstasy, even when he writes down what he has been commissioned to reveal. This condition Philo believes that he can describe from his own experience. There is an ecstasy mentioned in the Bible, but it is not this kind of ecstasy, nor is it the normal vehicle of inspiration, but something extraordinary; and the communication of the message to others does not take place in this state, with the possible exception of an involuntary prophecy like that of Balaam [but cf. II Kings iii. 15–19, and see Ecstasy]. The Biblical conception of ecstasy is that of a state in which supernatural revelations are imparted to men who, in their natural state, are incapable of perceiving them—either by divinely exhibited symbols, as in Acts x. 10; Jer. i. 11, 13, or by the communication of supernatural realities and images of future events, as in Num. xxiv. 3, 4, xxii. 31; II Kings vi. 17; cf. II Cor. xii. 1 sqq.; Rev. i. 10. In this state the percipient is either "in the Spirit," i.e., the limitations of his ordinary sensuous perceptions fall away altogether, or they are momentarily removed without the cessation of sensuous perception, and supernatural appearances present themselves in conjunction with those of ordinary life, as in Luke i. 11. In no case does the state seem to be one of which no memory is afterward preserved; the ecstasy is not (according to Augustine on Ps. lxvii.) a "mental alienation," but a "mental separation from physical sensation so that whatever is revealed is revealed to the spirit." The theory of Philo, or the Hellenistic theory, thus originated neither in the Old Testament nor in strictly Jewish theology outside of it, but much more directly in paganism. Philo's conception can not be put down wholly to the account of his Platonizing tendency, but contains other elements, possibly borrowed from Oriental religions. Still, it is in the main the general Greek conception of *enthousiasmos*, of the *mania* of the *manteis* ("prophet" or "diviner"), akin to the Platonic view of the source of artistic production and of prophecy.

2. Early Christian Doctrine.

The same pagan conception is encountered once more in the first definite expressions from Christian writers as to the nature and method of inspiration. In the Apostolic Fathers is found merely a simple expression of the fact of inspiration in the way in which they cite the Old Testament. But the second-century apologists emphasize the divine origin of the knowledge contained in Holy Scripture, and unquestionably teach an inspiration which is not merely mechanical, but mantic. In order to understand this, it must be remembered that these men, brought up in paganism, got at the same time their first impression of Christian truth and of the divine origin of the primary revelation and so of the Scriptures. The more Christianity claimed to be not the result of a logical process of thought, but a revelation made under the operation of the Spirit of God, the easier it was for them to apply to it the Greek conception of the origin of such knowledge; and the process was further facilitated by the respect paid to the Sibylline prophecies (see Sibylline Books). If this last fact be taken in connection with the prominent place which prophecy holds in Scripture, the importance which the apologists attached to prophecy can be understood, and that it was natural for them to refer all ancient prophecy to the working of the Spirit of God. There was no need of an acquaintance with Philo (of whom Justin speaks with great respect) to lead to this view, which finally found its most definite representation in Montanism. The opposition of the Church to Montanism was responsible for the fact that the doctrine of ecstasy as the form of inspiration found no continued recognition in the Church. Clement of Alexandria placed ecstasy among the marks of false prophets, and, from Origen on, the doctors of the Church rejected the conception of prophecy which originated in paganism. In direct opposition to Montanism, the unconscious action of the prophet was denied. This led to the other extreme; it placed the revelation of the Old Testament on the same level with that of the New, and so finally resulted in the not indeed mantic, but mechanical, doctrine of inspiration held by the older Protestant theologians. The attempts at a truer theory found in Irenæus' distinction between prophetic and apostolic inspiration (III., xi. 4), and his notion of a development in the history of God's redeeming work (IV., ix. 3), bore no fruit. The doctrine of the Fathers recognized both the unrestricted operation of the Holy Ghost upon the minds and wills of Scriptural authors and at the same time their own independent activity, to which more than mere form and style was attributed; but they seem to have made no attempt to frame a theory as to the manner in which these two were combined. Thus, e.g., Augustine, who says in one place that the Evangelists wrote "as each remembered, in accordance with his native powers, either briefly or at greater length" (*De consensu evangelistarum*, ii. 12), in another compares the apostles to hands that wrote down what the head, Christ, dictated (ib., i. 35). Among the Fathers Origen went most deeply into the question. What he says about it agrees closely with his theory that inspiration is an elevation of the mind and an opening of the inner ear to the truth—a higher degree of the illumination bestowed upon all pious believers. That so little use was made of Origen's suggestions was not a consequence of their connection with other parts of his system, or of the suspicion which was cast upon his orthodoxy, but rather of the fact that (when the epoch of the apologists was past and Montanism was conquered) there was little practical interest in these questions. In the controversies which distracted the Church the authority and the divine origin of the Scriptures were not called in question. With the issue of these conflicts and the strengthening of the Church's organization, the Church took its place by the side of the Scriptures as a coordinate authority, and even at times more than that, so that Augustine could say (*Adv. Manichæos*, v.), "I would not believe the Gospel against the authority of the Catholic Church." The acceptance of a continuous inspiration, expressed especially in the decisions of councils, gave rise to the theory of a twofold source of knowledge, as to which only a standard of judgment in matters of fact was required, not a decision as to the manner of inspiration. The emphasis laid by the school of Antioch on the human side of the Scriptures was not important enough, in view of the simultaneous recognition of their authority, to call forth much discussion as to inspiration itself. Even the bold assertions of Theodore of Mopsuestia that the Book of Job was a poem originating on heathen soil, that Canticles contained a tedious epithalamium, that Solomon (in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes) had the *logos gnōseōs*, "the gift of wisdom," but not the *logos sophias*, "the prophetic gift," did not touch the general theory of inspiration, but only raised the question whether all parts of the Scriptures had the same measure of (prophetic) inspiration; and the only result was the condemnation of these propositions by the Council of Constantinople.

By a natural process, the operation of the Holy Ghost occupied an increasingly prominent place, and the independent personality of the writers was less and less considered. When Agobard of Lyons dwelt upon the external signs of this independence, and remarked that the sacred writers had not always observed the strict rules of grammar, the Abbot Fridugis of Tours (q.v.) went so far as to assert that the Holy Spirit had formed "even the very verbal expressions in the mouth of the Apostles." And Agobard did not think of limiting the operation of the Spirit; he preferred to explain the phenomenon by a condescension on the part of the Holy Spirit to human weakness.

3. The Scholastic Period.

No deeper interest in the question was displayed by scholasticism, which discussed it, indeed, with its accustomed minuteness in connection with the rest of the system, but showed no sense of its importance in relation to revelation. Here and there, as from Anselm and Thomas Aquinas, it received more serious consideration. The latter treats the subject under the head of *gratiae gratis datae*, or *charismata*, distinguishing between the gift of knowledge and the gift of the word, without which the gift of knowledge would be useless to others. To express the right word, the Holy Ghost makes use of the tongue of men "as of an instrument, but he himself perfects the inner working." The blessing is sometimes diminished by the fault of the hearer, sometimes by that of the speaker. The operation of the Holy Ghost thus does no violence to the independence of the agent. The authority of the Scriptures was not questioned, but the impulse to use and to investigate them was not yet awakened. Mysticism had a deep feeling for the divine power of the Word and a clear understanding of the operation of the Holy Ghost. A belief in the continuance of the gift left the Scriptural inspiration not so radically different, in spite of its admitted precedence, from experiences which were possible to others; and so, even while its authority was firmly maintained, there was a certain indifference to its unique character. The assertion of Abelard, based upon Gal. ii. 11 sqq., that the prophets and apostles were not infallible, was employed with some hesitation by him; but when Renaissance scholarship pointed to defects in detail as results of the human limitations of the Scriptural writers, neither the Church nor scholars thought of the authority of the Bible as any less assured.

4. The Reformation.

Never since the apostolic age had so admirable a use been made of its pages, and never had its authority been so decidedly upheld as in the Reformation period; but for this very reason there was little speculation on the way in which it had come to be. No one disputed its authority; the only question was as to the manner of its use. This explains the fact that among the Reformers and their immediate successors the old conception of inspiration is still found without any further discussion of the mutual relations of the two factors in the formation of the Scriptures, and without any attempt to define the limits within which inspiration is attributed to them. As to the relation between the divine and human factors, Luther is equally certain that the Holy Ghost is the original author, and that the writers are to be known by their human characteristics and have put their own hearts into their work. Theoretically his teaching on this point is not to be distinguished from the traditional conception. For Calvin, too, the Bible is to be reverenced; the Holy Ghost is its author, though sometimes " he uses a rough and unpolished style." But this does not prevent Calvin from recognizing inaccuracies and seeing, with Luther, the expression of the human minds of the writers. Chemnitz is the first Lutheran theologian to attempt a systematic doctrine on the subject; but he is arguing against those who equally acknowledge the authority of the Bible, and the question of the nature and method of inspiration is not for him an urgent one. Selnecker includes inspiration under the head of revelation, and defines it as " a secret inbreathing by which the holy patriarchs and prophets were divinely taught many things "; but he places this process in unmistakable analogy with the indwelling and operation of the Spirit in other believers. Gerhard's full discussion of Scripture in general contains no more precise definition. But the more earnest these authors become in attempting to confirm the authority of the Bible, the less often are met concessions like those of Bugenhagen, that the Evangelists wrote " what to them seemed best," and that errors of the Septuagint passed over into the text of the New Testament.

5. Post-Reformation Development.

When it became necessary to argue not only against Rome, but against syncretism, and Calixtus, in approximation to Roman Catholic theologians, distinguished between inspiration in the strict sense, in regard to the essential truths of salvation, and a *directio divina* in regard to those things " which came by sensation or were otherwise known " for which no revelation but only guidance was needed, the time had come for a more rigid definition, for an assurance against the dangers which seemed to threaten the Bible among the very men who claimed to deduce their belief from it. Calovius was the founder of the new doctrine intended to serve this purpose. According to him, inspiration is the form of revelation. Nothing can be in the Scriptures " which was not to the writers divinely suggested and inspired." The doctrine was pushed to its extreme consequences by the Buxtorfs, who asserted the inspiration of even the Hebrew vowels, and by Voet, who made the same claim for the punctuation. All this was absolutely new. If the idea of ecstasy had been included, it might have seemed a revival of the mantic theory of Philo and the old apologists; but the lack of this conception made the process purely mechanical, not only without analogy, but in direct contradiction to the other operations of the Holy Spirit. The self-preparation of the writers, required on the ecstatic theory, was no longer necessary; nor was there any place for the personal witness which the apostles claim to give. The logical consequences of the doctrine were not, indeed, drawn by its supporters, but they are none the less inevitable. Against this hard and fast theory the freer view of the Roman Catholic theologians (such as Bellarmine, Canus, and Simon) was less effective than it might have been on account of their tendency to subordinate Scripture to the Church; and little more followed the maintenance of a less rigid theory by the Arminians and some French and German Calvinists. The first marked influence was exerted by Pietism, with its personal experience of the workings of the Spirit, in which it was joined by some kindred souls among the English dissenters, such as Baxter and Doddridge. By degrees the official theology of Protestantism took a freer attitude, and the human factor in inspiration assumed a new prominence.

6. Modern Development.

The modern development of the doctrine may be traced partly from Schleiermacher and partly from the school of Bengel. The former emphasized the special spirit of the Scriptures, of which rationalism had altogether lost sight; but this spirit was to him not the Spirit of God, independent of humanity, but his own conception of the term " Holy Spirit "—the common spirit of the Christian Church, the source of all its spiritual gifts and good works, as of all its processes of thought. Even the apocryphal writings are inspired, in so far as they show any trace of connection with the life of this spirit. The Old Testament, on the other hand, as the product not of the Christian but of the Jewish spirit, shares neither the dignity nor the inspiration of the New. The main emphasis is laid upon the human writers, who, by reason of their relation to Christ, are the authorized original witnesses to Christian truth. Schleiermacher's doctrine of inspiration is thus both formally and materially the exact opposite of the doctrine developed by the seventeenth-century theologians. It represents, however, a distinct and permanent progress, in the qualification of inspiration according to the period of history in which it appears, in the value placed upon the human factor for the attestation and communication of divine truth, in the proper placing of inspiration in the uniform and yet manifold working of the Holy Spirit, and of the literary work produced under its influence in the total of the authors' official activity. The first of these points, the relation of inspiration to history, is the one in which Schleiermacher's services were the most important. This is a point of departure for the modern development of the doctrine of inspiration, as represented by Rothe and Hofmann—though the connection is not always directly with Schleiermacher, but partially through the school of Bengel, whose most useful result is that formulated in 1793 by Menken in these words: " The Bible is no dogmatic treatise . . . it is much rather a historical, harmonious whole. All that it teaches, it teaches either immediately in history, or upon a basis of history, with its foundation and its interpretation in history." Space forbids to trace here the gradual development through the writings of individual modern authors who have handled this subject. As a rule they have renounced the theory of the direct operation of the Holy Spirit on the creation of the Scriptural books. They have replaced the old idea of inspiration, on the ground of its mantic content, apparently derived from a pagan source, by one which treats the Scriptures as venerable primitive documents; their value is decided by a historical judgment, which requires scientific investigation for its full validity. This limitation is balanced in some degree by the position given to the substance of the Bible, to the revelation of which it constitutes documentary evidence. Faith in this revelation is required in order to form a complete and perfect judgment of the Bible. The revelation works through the written word, though not as if this word were a direct product of the spirit of revelation. The written word is influenced by the ideas of the various periods, by defective conceptions, and by limited intelligence. It is the province of theological investigation to decide how far these influences have extended, in order to be able to designate the authoritative content or the permanent constituents of the revelation. It may not unnaturally be asked whether a purely documentary value will sufficiently explain the peculiar power and significance of the Scriptures in the history of the Church. From this point of view, Lipsius felt obliged to distinguish between the documentary character of the Bible, as the collection, officially made by the historical judgment of the Christian Church, of the records of its primitive spirit, and its religious significance resting on inspiration. According to this view, the Scripture is inspired because it is the historic record of the revelation in Christ, and at the same time the original witness of the salutary working of that revelation in the hearts of the first disciples, in which regard it is a product of the spirit of that revelation. That which is a permanent standard in it is not its outer form, on account of changing theological conceptions, but its inner content—that which remains after these outworn conceptions have been subtracted, as well as what may be referred to the personal limitations of its writers. It is imperative to separate the form from the content.

7. The Bible and Inspiration.

The attempt to explain the peculiar character of the Bible leads sooner or later to inspiration—i.e., to the belief that it owes this peculiar character to the operation of the Spirit of God upon its origin. It would be easy, but unjustifiable, to deny inspiration on the assumption that this must necessarily mean mantic inspiration. In order to understand the manner of the operation of the Holy Spirit, it must be known what Scripture says of this operation on its own origin; and to understand this again, the meaning of Paul's question in Gal. iii. 2 must be apprehended. There is nothing to justify drawing a sharp dividing-line between the indwelling of the Holy Ghost and his special operation upon the origin of Scripture. And some other answer to the question as to the true nature of the Bible than that it is merely a record of revelation is obligatory. From this point Kähler proceeds, and makes possible a successful attempt to answer the question as to the nature and value of the Bible and the nature and manner of inspiration. According to him, the Bible (primarily the New Testament, the Old only in conjunction with it) is the record of the fundamental Gospel of Christ and of salvation in him. In it exists the memorial of the primitive Christian assurance of salvation, intended to promote the salvation of the reader or hearer. This definition includes both the purpose and the content of the Bible, whereas that which regards it as merely a record of revelation neglects its immediate purpose, and moreover requires the formation of a historical judgment, for which not every one is competent. No such equipment is required in order to know that the New Testament is primarily the record of the fundamental Gospel of Christ, or that it bears the same witness of him as that with which Christianity began its conquering progress through the world. Whether men are willing to accept this salvation, so attested, is another question; but this Gospel is the Christian proclamation, in regard to which man must take one side or the other. This is the point so strongly insisted on by Frank, that every witness of Christ and of God's redeeming will is credible only in the measure in which it is in harmony with or confirmed by the Scriptures. These have the power in a special way to create obligation and to make him guilty before God who rejects their message. This power, this authority, is independent of the recognition of them, and through it they show themselves to be in a unique measure filled with the Spirit of God. It is this connection between the Holy Ghost and the witness of the Bible to which (in harmony with the Scriptural expressions themselves) is given the name of inspiration. It is this operation of the Spirit that Paul means when he says (I Cor. ii. 13) that he speaks "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth," and to which Christ himself refers when he tells his disciples (John xvi. 13) of the Spirit of truth that shall guide them "into all truth"—an operation which does not exclude, but empowers, the action of those who are to be the witnesses of the truth.

8. Nature and Method of Inspiration.

If the fact of inspiration is admitted in the sense of a special operation of the Holy Spirit on the origin of the Scriptures, on the ground of their unique significance as the primary record of the fundamental preaching of Christ, and their unique power to impose obligation, the next question which arises concerns the nature and method of this inspiration. To answer this, the first thing to notice is what this message tells—the redeeming acts of God in behalf of man, summed up and realized in Christ before the eye. It is with this that the entire Bible has to do. Its content is a history of the relations which have existed, or are to exist, between God and man, of the origin and execution of the plan of salvation. From this special connection between the Bible and the revelation of the redemption, faith easily perceives that its writers stand themselves in a special relation to the Holy Spirit. But of what nature this relation is can be determined only from the course of the history contained in their works, since it is a historical relation. Now, the relation varies with the period of history. The distinction between the Old- and New-Testament revelation is that between distance from God and nearness to him. In the earlier part, even when God enters into relations with those whom he chooses as witnesses of his redeeming purpose, he still speaks from without the world that they know. Thus in the Old Testament an expression is found which is foreign to the New, to designate his communications with his witnesses. This communication with the prophets is constantly designated by the expression "the word of Yahweh was upon," and the reception of this word by "he saw (Heb. *ḥazah*) the word of Yahweh" (Isa. ii. 1; Mic. i. 1; Amos i. 1). This distance between God and man is only rarely bridged, at special moments, and the immediate subjective perception of the word of God can only take place in an extraordinary manner. In the New Testament, on the other hand, the word of God, the expression of his saving will, has entered the world in Christ (Rom. x. 5–8; Titus i. 3; Acts x. 36, xiii. 26). To perceive and acknowledge the revelation now made, there is no need of special endowment, as in the case of the prophets; all that is required is the believing attitude toward Christ (Matt. xi. 25, xvi. 17). Those who are first called to look into the mystery of the love of God revealed in Christ are therewith called and qualified to be witnesses to him (Matt. x. 27; John xv. 15). This witness is conditioned by the objective revelation and redemption, taking place in Christ and entering the personal life by the indwelling of the Spirit. But it is not the same thing to participate in this salvation and to be called to witness it. The latter is a special mission, though not one confined to the apostles who were chosen as the first witnesses. Their assistants and the generation to whom they testified were also witnesses; and as such, from the special importance of their position in regard to all subsequent generations, they needed special assistance of the Spirit (I Cor. ii. 10 sqq.). The prerequisite is their own experience of salvation—the first experience of salvation ever given to man; but inspiration, in addition to this, is the special preparation for the bearing of testimony of a fundamental kind. It is their grace of office, their *charisma*, which empowers them, irrespective of their individual imperfections, to testify for all generations of the facts of salvation and their significance. In contrast with this condition, the inspiration of the Old Testament was temporarily, one might almost say accidentally, connected with the personality of those who received it, and not always given to those whose moral and religious nature qualified them for its reception (Num. xxii.–xxiv.; Jonah; cf. John xi. 49–52). Compared with the New Testament, it is less free. The apostolic witnesses have the Spirit of God for the spirit of their own personal lives, which makes it possible for them to be independent witnesses, not mere organs of God's activity. Another thing follows from the peculiar character of their inspiration as a permanent qualification. When Paul makes a distinction between what he says by commandment and his own opinion (see Consilia Evangelica), he does not mean to make a distinction between inspired and uninspired words; and accordingly he commends what he says with perfect confidence to the judgment of his readers (I Cor. x. 15, xi. 13; II Cor. iv. 2). And the inspiration of the witnesses being permanent, they can speak of things which do not pertain to salvation (as in II Tim. iv. 13) without the inspiration ceasing.

One more characteristic point of the manner of inspiration must be mentioned. The qualification of witnesses includes the presentation of historical events; but that which the Spirit of God here effects, whether in the Old or in the New Testament, is the understanding of history, not the knowledge of it. The latter is to be obtained in the ordinary way of life, by the witnessing of events or their collection from written or oral tradition. This explains certain phenomena in sacred history which resemble those of all other historical writing—discrepancies in minor details or in chronological order and the like. The question is not how such errors are possible in the inspired word of God, but how far the equipment named inspiration is meant to extend. The knowledge of and witness to the purest eternal truth is not only not inconsistent with human limitations, but stands out all the more strikingly when they are admitted. Inspiration is not the abolition of independent human personality, but rather a reenforcement of it; it is not condescension to human weakness, but a hallowing or transformation of it, that the human personality may take its part in the divine work. There is nothing in it foreign to Christian experience or to knowledge of the other operations of the Holy Spirit. It takes its own place in the system of the *charismata*, the gifts of grace operative in the Church of God. (H. Cremer†.)

9. The Theory of Plenary Inspiration.

Views of inspiration may be grouped in two general classes—those of plenary or verbal inspiration, and those of partial inspiration. Advocates of plenary inspiration hold that the writers of Scripture had the immediate influence of the Spirit to such an extent that they could not err in any point; every statement is accurate and infallible, whether "religious, scientific, historical, or geographical" (Charles Hodge, *Theology*, i. 163; cf. F. L. Patton, *Inspiration*, p. 92). Besides Hodge and Patton, Gaussen, Shedd, Given, and others represent this view. It is admitted, however, that there may be errors in the Scriptures as we now possess them and infallibility is asserted "only for the original autographic text" (A. A. Hodge and B. B. Warfield in the *Presbyterian Review*, ii., 1881, p. 245). This class of views has in its favor (1) the difficulty of conceiving how the thought could have been suggested by the Spirit without the language; and (2) the support it gives to the authority of the Scriptures as a system of truth and a guide of action. On the other hand, the following objections are urged: (1) It is hard on this general theory to account for the individual peculiarities of the writers. The style of Hosea differs from that of Isaiah, that of John from that of Paul, although the same Spirit suggested the language of each. It is urged, however, that the Spirit accommodated himself to the peculiarities of the writers. (2) There are differences of statement in the Scriptures concerning the same facts (cf.

Gen. xxxiii. 18–19 with Acts vii. 16; Num. xxv. 9 with I Cor. x. 8). (3) The theory makes it hard to explain the divergences in the Gospels (cf. the four forms in which the superscription on the cross is given and Matt. viii. 25–27 with Mark iv. 39–41). (4) It is difficult on this theory to understand why the New-Testament writers usually quote the Septuagint translation, and not the original Hebrew of the Old Testament. In many cases the divergence from the Hebrew text is great (cf. Acts xv. 16–17, other passages of the Acts, and many passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which always quotes from the Septuagint). (5) The autographs of the sacred writers are lost, and the variations in the copies which have been preserved seem to be inconsistent with this theory; for, if a literal inspiration were necessary for the Church, God (so we should expect) would have provided for the errorless preservation of the original text. Moreover, the great mass of Christians has to depend upon translations for none of which infallible accuracy is claimed.

10. The Theory of Partial Inspiration.

The theory of partial inspiration is, that the writers of Scripture enjoyed the influence of the Spirit to such an extent, that it is the Word, and contains the Will, of God (Luther, Calvin, Baxter, Doddridge, Wm. Lowth, Baumgarten, Neander, Tholuck, Stier, Lange, Hare, Alford, Van Oosterzee, Plumptre, F. W. Farrar, Dorner, and others). It admits mistakes, or the possibility of mistakes, in historical and geographical statements, but denies error in matters of faith or morals. In favor of this view it may be said: (1) that it lays stress upon the sense of Scripture as a revelation of God's will, and leaves room for the full play of human agency in the composition. (2) It helps to understand the divergences in the accounts of our Lord's life, and the inconsistencies in historical statement of different parts of the Bible. (3) It is more in accord with the method of the Spirit's working in general. The apostles were not perfect in their conduct and judgment as rulers and teachers of the Church (Acts xv. 39, xxiii. 3; Gal. ii. 12; I Cor. xiii. 12; Phil. iii. 12). (4) It removes a hindrance out of the way of many who would gladly believe the Bible to contain the word of God, if it were not necessary to give their assent to all its historical statements. Many can believe the discourses of our Lord in John (xii. sqq.) to be divine who can not so regard the list of the dukes of Edom (Gen. xxxvi. 15–43), or all the tables of the Books of Chronicles. (5) This view makes the absence of an absolutely pure text intelligible.

11. Criteria of Inspiration.

The present canon does not necessarily measure the extent of inspiration. Both must be determined by the same process, upon the basis of the contents of the books, the statements of their authors, their relation to Christ (in the New Testament), and the judgment of the Church. A book belonging to the present canon may not be inspired. Seven books of the New Testament were disputed in the Church of the first four centuries (see Canon of Scripture). The Roman Catholic canon of the Old Testament includes the Apocrypha, which are rejected by Protestants. Luther doubted the inspiration of Esther and held an unfavorable view of the Epistle of James and the Apocalypse. Calvin expressed doubts about II Peter. The Bible is an organism; and the inspiration of the whole is not necessarily affected if inspiration be denied to one part. The question of the inspiration of the Gospel of John, for example, may be independent of the proof that the Books of Chronicles are inspired. The sufficient witness of the heavenly origin of the Scriptures is their inherent excellences, as in the case of the person of Christ. The unity of the book, unfolding a single purpose; its elevated tone; the faultless character of Christ; the nature of the facts revealed of God, the soul, and the future—all stamp it as a work of more than ordinary human genius or insight. This testimony is, for most minds, the strongest of all. It is the testimony of the Holy Spirit in experience. D. S. Schaff.

12. Modern Tendencies and Developments.

The history of the doctrine of inspiration in Great Britain and America has followed the general fortunes of the same doctrine on the Continent, as indicated above; that is, it has oscillated between an interpretation which found its principle in a preponderating influence of the Spirit of God and a recognition in the human consciousness of a larger degree of free ethical action. In Great Britain and America the Calvinistic interest has declared for the first of the views referred to. In more recent times attention and interest have shifted to other aspects of this question. A distinction between Revelation (q.v.) and inspiration has been made, in which revelation stands for the objective side or content of the divine will or truth, inspiration for the subjective condition in which that will becomes known. Evolution has made men familiar with a law of development according to which the consciousness is in part determined by previous stages of thought and will. Comparative Religion (q.v.) has revealed phenomena of a similar character to Hebrew and Christian inspiration in the ethnic faiths, and a study of these has aided in a better apprehension of this fact. The history of the Christian religion with its earlier roots in the Hebrew religious life has made possible a truly historical interpretation of the rise and progress of the apprehension of God as revealed in Jesus Christ. The new study of psychology has shown the nature and place of inspiration in the consciousness of the sacred writers and speakers—an ultimate certainty and enthusiasm which gave to their message much of its authority and power. Biblical criticism has provided a broad basis of incontestable facts which have had to be reckoned with, and have thus forced here and there a fresh investigation of the whole question from an inductive point of view. Inspiration is seen to be an essential affair of personality and is therefore ethical, with conditions of its appearance which lie deep in character as well as in native endowment. Finally, the tests of inspiration are moral and spiritual—the degree to which the message of the speaker or writer answers to the ethical and religious needs of advancing human life. C. A. Beckwith.

Bibliography: On the history of the doctrine consult: G. F. N. Sonntag, *Doctrina inspirationis, ejusque ratio, historia et usus popularis*, Heidelberg, 1809; G. F. N. Credner, *De librorum N. T. inspiratione quid statuerint Christiani ante saeculum tertium medium*, vol. i., Jena, 1828; idem, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften*, i. 1–91, Halle, 1832; A. G. Rudelbach, in *Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie und Kirche*, i. 1–60, ii. 1–66, iv. 1–40; F. A. Tholuck, in *Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft*, 1850, pp. 16–18, 42–44; J. Delitzsch, *De inspiratione scriptorum quid statuerint patres apostolici*, Leipsic, 1872; K. F. A. Kahnis, *Dogmatik*, i. 268, Leipsic, 1874; K. R. Hagenbach, *History of Christian Doctrine*, i. 75, 115, ii. 14, 20, 166, iii. 55, 62, 314, Edinburgh, 1880–81; B. F. Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, London, 1888; W. Rohnert, *Was lehrt Luther von der Inspiration der Heiligen Schrift?* Leipsic, 1890; A. Zöllig, *Die Inspirationslehre des Origens*, Freiburg, 1902; and in general the works on the History of Dogma.

From the standpoint of dogmatics the subject is discussed in all the great treatises on that subject. The following may be taken as representative of the treatment in the "Systems of Theology": F. D. E. Schleiermacher, §§ 128–132, Berlin, 1821; A. D. C. Twesten, i., § 23, Hamburg, 1826; C. I. Nitzsch, §§ 37 sqq., Bonn, 1844, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1849; T. Dwight, New York, 1846; C. G. Finney, ib. 1851; R. Rothe, pp. 121 sqq., Gotha, 1863; H. Martensen, Edinburgh, 1866; J. T. Beck, §§ 88–101, Stuttgart, 1870; F. H. R. Frank, *System der christlichen Gewissheit*, ii., §§ 43–49, Erlangen, 1873; idem, *System der christlichen Wahrheit*, ii., § 43, ib. 1885; C. Hodge, 3 vols., New York, 1873; H. Voigt, *Fundamentaldogmatik*, § 21, Gotha, 1874; J. J. van Oosterzee, 2 vols., London, 1876; I. A. Dorner, *Glaubenslehre*, §§ 57–59, Berlin, 1879, Eng. transl., 4 vols., Edinburgh, 1880–82; W. B. Pope, New York, 1880; F. A. Philippi, i. 204 sqq., Gütersloh, 1881; A. E. Biedermann, §§ 179 sqq., Berlin, 1884–85; A. H. Strong, Rochester, 1886; W. G. T. Shedd, New York, 1888–94; S. Buell, ib. 1890; E. V. Gerhart, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ib. 1891; H. B. Smith, ib., 1890; J. Miley, London, 1892; M. A. Kähler, *Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre*, pp. 446 sqq., Leipsic, 1893; R. A. Lipsius, §§ 196 sqq., Brunswick, 1893; L. F. Stearns, New York, 1893; J. Bovon, 2 vols., Lausanne, 1895–96; H. Bawink, 4 vols., Kampe, 1895–1901; R. V. Forster, Nashville, 1898; N. Burwash, 2 vols., London, 1900; A. Bouvier, Paris, 1903; H. E. Jacobs, *Summary of the Christian Faith*, Philadelphia, 1905; A. H. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, i. 196–242, Philadelphia, 1907; F. J. Hall, *Dogmatic Theology*, vol. ii., New York, 1908.

Special treatises on the subject are: R. Baxter, *Catechising of Families*, London, 1683; R. Simon, *Traité de l'inspiration des livres sacrés*, Paris, 1687; W. Lowth, *Vindication of the Old and New Testaments*, Oxford, 1692; P. Doddridge, *The Inspiration of the New Testament*, in vol. iv. of his *Works*, Leeds, 1802; J. J. Griesbach, *Stricturarum in locum de theopneustia librorum sacrorum*, parts i.–v., Jena, 1784–88; J. D. Morell, *Phil. of Religion*, chaps. v., vi., New York, 1849; E. Henderson, *Divine Inspiration*, London, 1852; F. de Rougemont, *Christ et ses témoins: . . . révélation et inspiration*, 2 vols., Paris, 1856; C. A. Row, *The Nature and Extent of Divine Inspiration*, London, 1864; L. Gaussen, *Théopneustie*, Paris, 1862, Eng. transl., London, 1888; C. Wordsworth, *On the Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, ib. 1867; F. L. Patton, *The Inspiration of the Scriptures*, Philadelphia, 1869; E. Elliott, *Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures*, Edinburgh, 1877; W. E. Atwell, *The Pauline Theory of Inspiration*, London, 1878; H. Schultz, *Die Stellung des christlichen Glaubens zur heiligen Schrift*, Braunsberg, 1877; E. M. Goulburn, *On the Inspiration . . . of the Holy Scriptures*, London, 1878; W. R. Browne, *Inspiration of the New Testament*, ib. 1880; J. J. Given, *Truth of Scripture in connection with Revelation, Inspiration, and the Canon*, Edinburgh, 1881; J. G. W. Herrmann, *Die Bedeutung der Inspirationslehre*, Halle, 1882; G. T. Ladd, *The Doctrine of Holy Scripture*, New York, 1883; F. W. Farrar, J. Cairns, and others, *Inspiration: a Clerical Symposium*, London, 1884; R. Watts, *The Rule of Faith and the Doctrine of Inspiration*, ib. 1885; A. Cave, *The Inspiration of the Old Testament*, ib. 1888; C. A. Briggs, *Whither*, New York, 1889; A. Ritschl, *Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, ii. 9 sqq., Bonn, 1889; W. Kölling, *Prolegomena zur Lehre von der Theopneustie*, Breslau, 1890; idem, *Die Lehre von der Theopneustie*, ib. 1891; C. A. Briggs, Ll. J. Evans, H. P. Smith, *Inspiration and Inerrancy*, Edinburgh, 1891; E. Haupt, *Die Bedeutung der heiligen Schrift*, Bielefeld, 1891; W. Sanday, *The Oracles of God*, London, 1891; idem, *Inspiration*, ib. 1896; F. J. Sharr, *The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures*, London, 1891; J. Clifford, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible*, ib. 1892; W. F. Gess, *Die Inspiration der Helden der Bibel*, Basel, 1892; W. Lee, *Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, New York, 1892; J. DeWitt, *What is Inspiration?* ib. 1893; J. Denney, *Studies in Theology*, London, 1895; M. A. Kähler, *Unser Streit um die Bibel*, Leipsic, 1895; M. von Nathusius, *Ueber die Inspiration der heiligen Schrift*, Stuttgart, 1895; H. Cremer, *Glaube, Schrift, und heilige Geschichte*, Gütersloh, 1896; G. S. Barrett, *The Bible and its Inspiration*, London, 1897; P. Gennrich, *Der Kampf um die Schrift in der deutsch-evangelischen Kirche des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin, 1898 (contains a rich bibliography of the German literature on the subject); C. Chauvin, *Die Inspiration der heiligen Schrift nach der Lehre der Tradition*, Regensburg, 1899; O. P. Zanecchia, *Divina inspiratio sacrarum scripturarum*, Rome, 1898; M. Arnold, *Literature and Dogma*, London, 1902; A. Loisy, *L'Évangile et l'église*, Paris, 1902, Eng. transl., New York, 1904; H. H. Kuyper, *Evolutie ov revelatie*, Amsterdam, 1903; J. E. McFadyen, *O. T. Criticism and the Christian Church*, pp. 268–312, New York, 1903; J. A. Robinson, *Some Thoughts on Inspiration*, London, 1905; R. F. Horton, *Inspiration and the Bible*, ib. 1906; C. Pesch, *De inspiratione sacrae scripturae*, Freiburg, 1906; J. M. Gibson, *Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture*, London, 1908; *DB*, i. 296–299, ii. 475–476; *DCG*, i. 831–835; Farrar, in *Biblical Educator*, vols. i.–ii.

INSPIRED, THE: The name given to a sect which originated in Germany about 1700. It was formed from the large number of Separatists who already existed there, and was animated by the impulse given by the new prophets of the Camisards (q.v.) in the Cévennes. The sectaries took their name from the fact that they recognized a continuous divine inspiration in certain individuals, whom they regarded as instruments of the Holy Spirit, to whose teachings they professed obedience as to inspiration.

Appearance in England and Germany.

After the forcible suppression of the Protestants in the Cévennes, some of the principal leaders and prophets, such as Élie Marion, Durande Fage, Jean Cavalier, and Jean Allut, fled to England and Scotland in 1706 (see French Prophets), which they soon left for the Netherlands, uttering in both countries impassioned denunciations of France and the papacy. When their prophecies were not fulfilled, they were excluded from the French Reformed community in London and from the Church of England as well, so that they had no recourse but to found a sect of their own. Allut and Marion accordingly went, in 1711, to the Netherlands and Germany, seeking support primarily among the numerous colonies of French Protestants there, from whom, however, they gained little sympathy. They had more success with the Pietists and Separatists of northwestern Germany, to whose craving for apocalyptic revelations and fanatical enthusiasm they were able to appeal. They laid their first foundations at Halle in 1713 and at Berlin in 1714, and held a love-feast at Halle in the latter year. At first they found some support among the clergy, but when the gift of inspiration began to spread among the "awakened" of German birth, including in Halle the eighteen-year-old daughter of a servant of Francke, and in Berlin a tailor who later became insane, the whole movement was regarded with suspicion, if not with contempt. Three brothers named Pott, until then students at Halle, who had become "awakened," migrated with their fanatical mother to the Wetterau in 1714, and there built up an inspirational community, chiefly composed of Swabians and Franconians. As in the case of the prophets of the Cévennes, so here inspired utterances were preceded by remarkable physical phenomena, such as a burning around the heart, shortness of breath, and various convulsive movements of the head and limbs. These conditions were followed by a state of unconscious ecstasy, and during this time the message was received. This, as a rule, was immediately given out, either by pantomimic gestures or, more frequently, in brief phrases of a Scriptural character, spoken in an unnaturally loud voice. The content of these messages, usually delivered in the first person as in the name of God, resembled the warnings and promises of the Hebrew prophets, and dealt with the necessity of repentance, conversion, and practical Christianity, frequently being remarkable revelations of the lives of the persons to whom they were addressed.

German Societies.

Under the influence of these phenomena societies arose which, after 1716, called themselves "the True Inspired," in contrast with the free or false inspired who rejected all organization and discipline. The enthusiasm of the movement spread not only among the Separatists of the Wetterau and Wittgenstein, but throughout Western Germany (especially Württemberg, the Palatinate, and Alsace) and Switzerland, and even extended into Northern and Eastern Germany, as far as Saxony and Bohemia. The call and the preparation for missionary journeys among the unbelievers were given in solemn love-feasts, prefaced by preliminary exercises for days beforehand, and characterized by fervent devotion. It was naturally difficult to maintain this devotion at such a high level, even when it was nourished by trial and persecution; and many of the "vessels" quickly ceased to give forth their messages. Those who remained true formed a constitution at Büdingen in 1716, according to which ten communities were founded in that neighborhood, some of which remained in existence almost until the middle of the nineteenth century, while others grew up in Württemberg, Swabia, and Switzerland. Each community had a president and two associate elders, who regulated all its affairs, especially the care of the poor and the maintenance of discipline, and held occasional conferences with the heads of other communities. There was no special teaching office, but all adults were expected to take their part in free public prayer at the meetings (daily or at least twice on Sunday), at which many hymns were sung, while the readings were chosen either from the Bible or from the fifty written or printed discourses of the "vessels," unless a "vessel" was present and delivered a new homily, prepared especially for the occasion. The dogmatic belief of the inspired agreed in general with that of the Evangelical Church at large, though, like other Separatists, they rejected all communion with it (as in baptism and the Lord's Supper). Their practical principles were those of the mystics Schwenckfeld, Böhme, Weigel, and Hoburg. They regarded marriage with special disfavor, though they tolerated it for a time.

Johann Friedrich Rock.

By 1719 all the "other vessels" had ceased to testify, and Johann Friedrich Rock, as the last of them, became, with Eberhard Ludwig Gruber (a clergyman; b. 1665; d. 1728), the head of the communities. Rock was born at Oberwälden, near Göppingen, Württemberg, in 1678. He came of a family of preachers and was himself a harnessmaker by trade. He had an inclination to mysticism, was seized with "inspiration" about 1707, and thereafter worked for the cause with self-sacrificing zeal until his death in 1749. He had some gifts of preaching and riming, and seems to have been a man of true piety notwithstanding his aberrations. With the emigration of many Separatists to Germantown, Pa., after 1725, and with the rise of the Herrnhut movement after 1730, his task became increasingly difficult. Particularly painful to him were his controversies with Count Zinzendorf, who had originally stood in close relations with Rock and his colleagues, but had gradually approached more nearly to the Established Church after 1732, and two years later had definitely broken with Rock on the ground of his rejection of the sacraments. Between 1740 and 1748 Rock was engaged in bitter controversy with another former friend, Johann Kaiser, a follower of Böhme, Molinos, and Mme. Guyon, who had founded a philadelphian society at Stuttgart in 1710, and after its decay had established an inspirational community in 1717. This controversy forms the source of the clearest and most important statements regarding the nature of the inspirational movement.

Revival after 1820 and Emigration to America.

The death of Rock marked the beginning of a period of steady decline, so that it is surprising to find a recrudescence of these societies, unvitalized by preaching or sacraments (celebration of the Lord's Supper seems to have been first resumed after 1820), after a complete quiescence of sixty or seventy years. With the revival of devotion in the established Churches, however, the gift of inspiration appeared once more among the "awakened" Separatists, and (according to the testimony of eye-witnesses) in the same manner as among the Camisards or in the Wetterau. Under the influence of three new "vessels"—Michael Krausert of Strasburg; Barbara Heinemann (after marriage, Barbara Landmann) of Leilersweiler in Alsace, a peasant girl, unable to read or write; and Christian Metz, a joiner—the communities in Alsace, the Palatinate, and the Wetterau, which were almost extinct, were reorganized between 1816 and 1821 on the old constitution of Gruber, but the repressive measures of the Prussian and Hessian governments caused them to emigrate in 1842–46, about 800 strong, to Ebenezer, near Buffalo, N. Y., where they soon had a flourishing communistic settlement numbering between 1,500 and 2,000 souls. In 1854 part of this community migrated to Amana, Iowa. See COMMUNISM, II., 3. (A. HEGLER†.) K. HOLL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A very comprehensive treatment of the subject has been given by M. Göbel, in *ZHT*, 1854, 1855, 1857, upon which subsequent discussions are based. Consult further: M. Göbel, *Geschichte des christlichen Lebens*, iii. 126 sqq., Coblenz, 1860; A. Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, ii. 366 sqq., iii. 265 sqq., Bonn, 1880–86; K. Knortz, *Die wahre Inspirationsgemeinde in Iowa*, Leipsic, 1896; W. Hadorn, *Die Inspirierten des 18. Jahrhunderts*, in *Schweizerische theologische Zeitschrift*, 1900, pp. 184 sqq.; and the literature under COMMUNISM, II., 3. On Rock, consult *ADB*, xxxviii. 735.

INSTALLATION: Generally, the ceremonial act by which a person ordained and appointed is formally put into possession of an ecclesiastical dignity or benefice. In the English Church the term is applied specially to the office of a canon or prebendary (i.e., the act of placing him in his stall) or to the enthronization of a bishop.

INSTITUTE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. See ENGLISH LADIES.

INSTITUTION: In canon law, the final act by which a person elected by the chapter, or nominated by the government, is appointed by the proper authority to an ecclesiastical benefice, more especially a bishopric.

INTENTION. See SACRAMENT, § 4.

INTERCESSION. See MEDIATOR.

INTERDICT: The prohibition of public worship and of the administration of the sacraments (*interdictum officiorum divinorum*), as an ecclesiastical penalty. An *interdictum locale* applies to a definite place or district, an *interdictum personale* to definite persons. The former is the more frequent, especially the *interdictum generale*, which the medieval popes pronounced against whole countries in their conflicts with secular rulers. Instances of the use of the interdict may be found as early as the time of Gregory of Tours; but not till the eleventh century did it become a regular part of ecclesiastical law, and only gradually did it assume the character of a definite institution with fixed limitations which it bears in the *Corpus juris canonici*. The total interdict forbade public worship, the administration of the sacraments, and Christian burial. Mitigations gradually came in; in 1173 Alexander III. allowed the baptism of infants and the absolution of the dying; in 1208 Innocent III. added confirmation and preaching, absolution under certain conditions, the private burial of clerics, the recitation of the canonical hours, and low masses in convents of regulars, extending this last privilege a year later to bishops. These concessions were granted on condition that no excommunicated or personally interdicted persons be present, that the doors be closed, and that no bells be rung. Boniface VIII., who also allowed baptism and confirmation of adults, permitted public worship with open doors and ringing of bells at Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, and the Assumption; Martin V. and Eugenius IV. extended this privilege to the whole octave of Corpus Christi, and Leo X. to that of the Conception. Special exemptions were granted to the Franciscans and other religious orders; but Clement V. and the Council of Trent insisted on their observance of the interdict. A local interdict was last proclaimed by Paul V. in 1606, against the republic of Venice. It is no longer considered a practical part of church discipline, but the right to impose it is theoretically maintained. Both personal and local interdicts may occur as "censures of broad application." The right to impose them is held to be inherent in the pope, councils, bishops (regularly with their chapters, sometimes without them), and in special cases the chapters themselves; monastic superiors may also impose personal interdicts upon their subjects. Interdicts may terminate of themselves if a condition has been expressed; otherwise they are removed by the person who imposed them, his successor, delegate, or superior. Only a bishop can absolve from a local interdict "of broad application"; but any approved confessor may remove a particular personal interdict. This form of penalty does not occur in Protestant ecclesiastical law. (C. T. G. VON SCHEURL†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bingham, *Origines*, XVI., iii. 7; L. Ferraris, *Prompta bibliotheca canonica*, s.v. "Inderdictum," 11 vols., Venice, 1782–94; A. L. Richter, *Lehrbuch des . . . Kirchenrechts*, ed. W. Kahl, pp. 783 sqq., Leipsic, 1886; E. Friedberg, *Lehrbuch des . . . Kirchenrechts*, pp. 274 sqq., ib. 1895; P. Hinschius, *Das Kirchenrecht . . . in Deutschland*, v. 19 sqq., Berlin, 1895; Neander, *Christian Church*, iii. 355–356, 454, iv. 161 et passim; E. B. Krehbiel, *The Interdict, its History and its Operation*, Washington, 1909.

INTERIM: The name of three provisional and temporary arrangements between the Protestants of Germany and the Roman Catholic Church in the time of the Reformation, intended to be valid only for the interval pending a final settlement of religious differences by a general council (whence the name, from Lat. *interim*, "meanwhile").

1. The Regensburg Interim: The outcome of the Conference of Regensburg in 1541. See REGENSBURG, CONFERENCE OF.

2. The Augsburg Interim: Adopted at the diet at Augsburg June 30, 1548. After the Schmalkald War, Charles V. thought of reestablishing religious unity in Germany; and at the diet in session in Augsburg in 1547 it was agreed that a provisional arrangement should be made until the Council of Trent had completed its work. In Feb., 1548, Charles chose a commission from both communions to devise an arrangement; this commission could not reach an agreement, and several states proposed that the matter be turned over to the theologians. Consequently, at the command of the emperor, Julius Pflug, bishop of Naumburg, Michael Helding, suffragan bishop of Mainz, and Johann Agricola, court preacher to the elector of Brandenburg, prepared a draft, which was then revised by certain Spanish monks and was secretly submitted by the emperor to the Protestant electors and prominent Roman Catholics of the empire. In twenty-six articles it treated of man before and after the fall (i.–ii.), of redemption through Christ (iii.), of justification (iv.–vi.), of love and good works (vii.), of forgiveness of sins (viii.), of the Church (ix.–xii.), of bishops (xiii.), of the sacraments (xiv.–xxi.), of the sacrifice of the mass (xxii.), of the saints (xxiii.), of the commemoration of the dead (xxiv.), of the communion at the mass (xxv.), and of the ceremonies of the sacraments (xxvi.). Although the views of the Protestants were taken into account in a general way, the document revealed the old Church with its faith and worship. In the belief that the Interim applied to all imperial estates, the electors of Brandenburg and the Palatinate approved it. After a long opposition Elector Maurice of Saxony and Margrave Hans of Küstrin promised not to protest openly if all imperial estates should approve and accept it. The Roman Catholics, however, were not willing to make any concessions. On May 15, 1548, Charles assembled the imperial estates and demanded their submission. He admonished the Protestants to return to the old faith or to live in accordance with the Interim, while the Roman Catholics were to remain faithful to the ordinances of their Church. Elector Maurice, Margrave Hans, and their adherents were greatly angered because only the Protestants were to be compelled to accept the Interim, but in accordance with their promise they did not protest. On June 30, 1548, the Interim became imperial law. In South Germany the emperor succeeded in introducing it in some cities and territories by force, but in the rest of Germany his orders were not carried out. In the Palatinate, Brandenburg, Saxony, Weimar, Hesse, Mecklenburg, Pomerania, and other states, as well as in the North German cities, there arose vehement opposition, of which Magdeburg became the center, headed by men like Flacius, Amsdorf, and Gallus, while Agricola and Melanchthon were inclined to compromise.

3. The Leipsic Interim: Adopted by the Saxon diet at Leipsic Dec., 1548. After his return from the diet at Augsburg, Maurice of Saxony assembled his prominent councilors and theologians at Meissen to discuss the imperial Interim. He was resolutely bent upon adhering to the Evangelical doctrine, but was anxious to have a frank and definite statement of what might be accepted and what must be rejected on the ground of Scripture. After a careful and conscientious examination, the theologians flatly rejected the entire Augsburg document. After a royal and imperial admonition to introduce it in Saxony, a new discussion took place in Torgau Oct. 18, 1548. The electoral councilors laid before the theologians a list of the points which in their estimation were acceptable and might lead to a new church order. Melanchthon agreed with most of the points. Deliberations were continued in Altzella Nov. 19–22, and, under stress of the news of the emperor's forcible measures in South Germany, an interim was drawn up which, in the doctrine of justification and in other points, upheld the Protestant doctrine, while it conceded as "Adiaphora" (q.v.) such things as extreme unction, the mass, lights, vestments, vessels, images, fasts and festivals, and the like. Maurice and Joachim of Brandenburg came to an agreement and put in writing what they would accept. The Saxon diet met in Leipsic on Dec. 21 and accepted the Altzella resolutions; the bishops of Naumburg and Meissen, however, refused to concur, because in their opinion it was reserved to the emperor alone to make changes in the (Augsburg) Interim. The ultimate outcome was that things remained as before.

At the diet at Augsburg in 1550–51 the majority of the estates advocated the continuation of the Council of Trent and urged the emperor to compel Protestants to accept the Interim. When the imperial invitation to the council arrived in Dresden, Maurice began negotiations with the Protestant estates concerning a general agreement. In Dessau Melanchthon with Prince George of Anhalt drew up the so-called Saxon Confession, which was approved by Maurice, Hans of Küstrin, the dukes of Mecklenburg and Pomerania, and others. It was proposed that certain Saxon theologians should go to Trent under safe protection and defend the pure doctrine. In Jan., 1552, Melanchthon, with two others, started on the journey and got as far as Augsburg; but in March they were called back because the war against the emperor began. The expedition of Maurice to South Germany occasioned the suspension of the Council of Trent. The Treaty of Passau annihilated the Interim and led to the Religious Peace of Augsburg (q.v.). (S. ISSLEIB.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. Beutel, *Ueber den Ursprung des Augsburger Interims*, Dresden, 1888; G. P. Fisher, *The Reformation*, pp. 165–214, New York, 1873; A. von Druffel, *Briefe und Akten zur Geschichte des 16. Jahrhunderts*, iii. 42 sqq., Munich, 1882; C. Beard, *The Reformation*, pp. 109, 243, 210, London, 1883; F. von Bezold, *Geschichte der deutschen Reformation*, pp. 805–808, Berlin, 1890; S. Issleib, in *Neues Archiv für sächsische Geschichte*, xiii. 188 sqq., xv. 193 sqq., Dresden, 1892–94; idem, *Moritz von Sachsen*, pp. 189–213, Leipsic, 1907; W. Walker, *The Reformation*, pp. 207–208, 218, New York, 1900; J. Babington, *The Reformation*, pp. 113–114, London, 1901; *Cambridge Modern History, The Reformation*, pp. 264–266, New York, 1904.

INTERMEDIATE STATE: A term designating both the period and the condition of the soul between death and the final judgment. The intermediate state is an aspect of the doctrine of Hades (q.v.). It has assumed many forms. (1) The early doctrine, which in general has continued to be the common view, that the dead remain in a condition of privation until the resurrection—the righteous happier (martyrs going at once to Paradise), the wicked more miserable, than while on earth (Irenæus, *Haer.* v. 31; Tertullian, "On the Soul," lv.). (2) Purgatory, the condition of those who depart this life in faith, yet are still liable to punitive sufferings for venial sins and who are purged before their entrance into heaven; such may be "helped" by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar" (Council of Trent, Sess. xxv.; see PURGATORY). (3) The limbo of the Fathers is the abode of Old-Testament saints to whom after his death Christ preached the Gospel (Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, qu. 69, art. 4; Dante, *Divine Comedy*, *Inferno*, Canto iv.; W. E. Addis and T. Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, pp. 564–565, London, 1903). (4) The limbo of infants is the region to which unbaptized infants are consigned after death, to remain forever in a state of privation, without suffering and also without happiness, a doctrine based on the universal necessity of baptism for the remission of the guilt of original sin (Thomas Aquinas, ut sup., qu. 69, art. 6; see INFANT SALVATION; LIMBUS). (5) The sleep of souls, based on such passages as Acts vii. 60, xiii. 36; I Cor. xv. 6, 18, 20, 51; I Thess. iv. 13–15. Between death and the second coming of Christ all souls are in a dreamless sleep (thus oblivious of the lapse of time and without moral change) from which they are simultaneously awakened for the judgment. This view was opposed in the early Church (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* VI., xxxvii.). Calvin wrote in refutation of it *Psychopannychia* (1534), directed against the Anabaptists. Richard Whately presented it with great force and sympathy as an alternative belief, in his work *On the Future State* (London, 1829). It is an article of faith among the several branches of Adventists (q.v.). (6) Preservation of the spiritual element of both the saved and the unsaved during the middle state, when by a creative act of God soul and body are reunited before the judgment. This element of the personality exists in various degrees of consciousness, knowledge, and enjoyment, some sleeping, some learning, some as demons on earth, some imprisoned in the abyss or suffering in Hades for life's sins, some being evangelized. In the interval between death and the resurrection the Gospel may be accepted or finally refused by those who have not known it here below (Edward White, *Life in Christ*, chap. xxi., London, 1878). (7) A relatively bodiless condition in which the pious dead are in a state of privation, to be described as inwardness and spirituality and progressive development, of deepest retirement, and of withdrawal into self, and at the same time of communion with Christ (cf. H. L. Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, § 276, Edinburgh, 1866; J. J. van Oosterzee, *Christian Dogmatics*, § cxlii., London, 1870; I. A. Dorner, *System of Christian Doctrine*, iv. 212, Edinburgh, 1880–82). (8) As to the unbelieving dead, who have not decisively rejected the Gospel, the intermediate state opens the door of repentance and spiritual life (see ESCHATOLOGY; PROBATION, FUTURE).

C. A. BECKWITH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature of the subject is well covered under ESCHATOLOGY; HADES; and PROBATION, FUTURE (qq.v.). Consult further: V. U. Maywhalen, *The Intermediate State*, London, 1856; H. M. Luckock, *The Intermediate State between Death and Judgment*, ib., 1890; T. H. Stockwell, editor, *Our Dead: Where are They? A Symposium*, ib., 1890; A. Williamson, *The Intermediate State*, ib., 1891; G. S. Barrett, *The Intermediate State; the Last Things*, ib., 1896; C. H. H. Wright, *Intermediate State and Prayers for the Dead*, ib. 1900; G. T. Fechner, *Little Book of Life after Death*, Boston, 1904; S. C. Gayford, *Life after Death*, chaps. ii.–iii., Milwaukee, 1909.

INTERPOLATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT: In its rigorous sense, an interpolation is an insertion in a text or document with the object of obtaining backing or authority for the interpolator's opinion or project. This is the ordinary dictionary sense of the group of words, "interpolation, interpolate, interpolator." This is also the meaning assigned to the word by legal usage, according to which an interpolation is an insertion within a will or deed, or a molding of its text to an end distinct from the original end and aim of the text itself. The same sense is assigned to the word by diplomacy, where an interpolation is a tampering with the text of a public document by one party to it, in order to gain an advantage over the other party. Thus "interpolation" seems to imply, first, a fixed text and, secondly, a conscious or deliberate purpose to alter or twist the meaning and intention of a text, the interpolator's aim being to slip his meaning under cover of a mind having greater authority or higher standing than his own, so securing for his own opinion or judgment a market-value above its intrinsic worth. For example, a Christian student of the second century inserted in the text of Josephus (*Ant.* XVIII., iii. 3) the well-known passage regarding Jesus. His object was to make Josephus a witness to Christ. This is an interpolation in the rigorous sense.

Definition.

Strict Sense Inapplicable to New Testament.

It is doubtful, however, whether the word in this sense can be safely and correctly applied to any part of the field of text-variation in the New Testament. At least, if used at all, it must be used with caution. The conditions of thought have materially altered since the word came into use. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when for the first time Christians began to be seriously disturbed by text-variation (the life and work of Brian Walton and of Johann Albrecht Bengel [q.v.] yield examples), the standing view of the New Testament has regarded it as an inerrant book or collection of books written by inspired individuals. This conception seemed to involve a belief that the text, once for all delivered in apostolic autographs, should have been closed against change. It was this conception which gave rise to the furious controversies in England (nineteenth century) over the "three witnesses" passage (I John v. 7). Both the conservative and the anticonservative forces of Christendom gave the idea of interpolation great vogue. The currency of the idea depended therefore on a body of related ideas. But those ideas have been modified in order to bring them into agreement with widening and deepening knowledge of the apostolic age. Neither of the two conditions presupposed by the rigorous definition of the term interpolation can be placed within the period when the New-Testament literature was coming to the light. The conception of the inspired text as an apostolic autograph, finished, like a modern book, at the time of publication, has broken down under the pressure of historical truth. Regarding the Gospels, it is known (see GOSPELS) that the author of a single Gospel was quite as much corporate as individual. The text remained plastic for a considerable period. The "Gospel" was not thought of as a book, but as a living word, a spiritual climax, a majestic conviction. So long as this conception had sway, the gospel-text lay open to the formative and molding forces of the Christian consciousness. It was not till deep in the second century that this situation altogether passed away. When that happened, when the Gospel came to be thought of as a book, the text became fixed and rigid. The Church's theory of inspiration and the zeal of scholars and theologians endowed the text with powers of resistance sufficient to withstand the ceaseless tendency to mold it by interpretation.

So then the possibility of text-molding continued deep into the second century. The last twelve

Examples from the Gospels.

verses of St. Mark's Gospel are a case in point. The conclusion of the Gospel somehow fell into confusion, was torn off, or lost. A reverent scholar, probably in the first half of the second century, wrote in the present conclusion, taking his materials from Matthew and Luke. The doxology to the Lord's Prayer in one form of the Matthean text (Matt. v. 13) is another example. The Prayer was soon taken into the corporate worship of Jewish Christians. Designed by Jesus not so much for a specific prayer as to show the framework and perspective of prayer, it needed the ascription to qualify it for liturgical uses. The Christians who made the addition had no thought of doing injury to Christ's authority or tampering with his meaning. They rather supposed that they were asserting his authority and publishing his mind. Consequently, the second of the conditions stated above, a deliberate purpose to alter the text, is wholly lacking. Both conditions therefore being absent, doubt regarding the correctness and propriety of the term in the New-Testament field appears to be well founded, so far as the Gospels are concerned. The phenomena of interpolation, under the pressure of recent discoveries, are converted in large measure into one element of a much larger and more vital problem, namely the part played by Christian interpretation of the person of Christ in bringing the *Logia,* the saving words of Jesus, into their present text. One example will serve, the text of our Lord's teaching about divorce (Matt. v. 32, xix. 9; Mark x. 9 sqq.; Luke xvi. 18). A strong, if not a decisive, body of scholarly opinion, renders it probable that the permission of divorce on the ground of fornication or adultery was no part of our Lord's teaching. Mark and Luke are silent. Furthermore, this exception to his prohibition of divorce seems to run counter to his methods as an inspirer of constructive morality. Except in this one instance, he deals with the supreme ideals in their perfection of spiritual and moral beauty. Therefore it seems probable that the Matthean text is a molded form of the original *logion,* and that the change took place as the result of debates between Jewish Christians and Jews over the interpretation of Deut. xxiv. 1. But no scholar would think of applying the word "interpolation" to the process.

Further Examples.

The same process goes on in the New-Testament text outside the Gospels. Harnack and others have recently affirmed that "things strangled" (Acts xv. 29) was never a part of the original Lucan text, but was read in by later Christians. This is problematical. But there is little that is problematical regarding the present text of Eph. iii. 5. St. Paul wrote the letter to the Ephesians (see Paul). He did not write and could not have written "as it was revealed to his holy apostles." These words show the handiwork of the Paulinist editor of the Pauline letters. It is, however, quite a different affair to say that the editor was an interpolator. Indeed, the use of the term seems to involve a view of the origin and growth of the New-Testament Scriptures which is decisively contradicted by a large and growing body of facts. It would be, for example, a serious misnomer to call John viii. 53–ix. 11 (the woman taken in adultery) an interpolation. That it is no part of the Johannine text is now agreed on all hands. Yet there are strong grounds for believing the story to be a piece of genuine and trustworthy tradition. Some day, when the Churches have recovered their self-possession, this fragment may find itself printed along with other extra-canonical sayings of Jesus as an appendix to the New Testament. Again, John v. 3–4 (the account of the angel stirring the waters) can not justly be called an interpolation. No conscious, deliberate intention to tamper with the text is here in question. The variant is found within a class of phenomena which belong to the history of the conflict between the text and the margin. How natural, how irresistible even the conflict is, may be illustrated by the history of the greatest hymns and their use in the churches (cf. Julian, *Hymnology,* s.v. "Rock of Ages" or "Nearer, my God, to Thee"). When once a noble hymn has been taken to the heart of the living Church it begins to pay taxes for its right to rule. Similarly, sane historical views of the sacred text help to realize the immense pressure brought to bear on a book like the Bible incessantly employed and appealed to by canonist and theologian, by the preacher and the pastor and the saint, and to prevent wonder at the irrepressible conflict, under certain conditions, between the text and the margin. The case which seems to come nearest to the requirements of rigorous definition is I John vii. 6–8a (the "three heavenly witnesses"). The authority against it is overwhelming, and its entrance into the Greek text is illuminating. Erasmus omitted it in the first edition of his Greek Testament (1516). A great outcry was raised, and Erasmus offered to insert the reading if a single Greek manuscript containing it could be found. One was found, later study of which made probable that its text for I John had been achieved by a translation, at a very late period, out of Latin into Greek. But Erasmus kept his word, and the reading appeared in his second edition. It became a part of the commercial text of the New Testament and passed into the so-called *textus receptus* of 1633.

Henry S. Nash.

Bibliography: The subject is generally dealt with in works on the textual criticism of the N. T., and much of the literature named under Bible Text (ii. 112–113 of this work) contains matter upon it, particularly the works of Copinger and Kenyon named there; works on the general introduction to the N. T. also discuss the subject (see Biblical Introduction). Special mention may be made of B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *N. T. in the Original Greek,* i. 571 sqq., ii. 325 sqq., New York, 1882; P. Schaff, *Companion to the Greek Testament and the English Versions,* pp. 183 sqq., 420 sqq., ib. 1883; F. H. A. Scrivener, *Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament,* i. 7–9, ii. 249, 321 sqq., London, 1894; C. A. Briggs, *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture,* chap. x., New [York, 1899; C. R. Gregory, *Canon and Text of the N. T.,* pp. 508 sqq., ib. 1907.

INTERSTITIA: The intervals supposed to elapse, according to Roman Catholic canon law, between the times of a man's receiving the different orders. The principle that there should be such intervals is expressly laid down in the thirteenth canon of the Council of Sardica (343). It was observed in regard to the minor orders as long as they had distinct functions, but this ceased when they became mere formal steps to the higher. The Council of Trent endeavored to restore their former actual significance, and prescribed the observance of the *interstitia* for them, unless the bishop should judge it better to proceed otherwise. At the present day it is customary in many places to confer the tonsure and all the minor orders on the same day. It was also decreed at Trent that a year should elapse between the minor and major orders, and between each of the latter, unless necessity or the general good required the time to be shortened, and that two major orders should never be conferred on the same day. In reference to the bishop's dispensing power, moreover, the Congregation of the Council has positively forbidden the conferring of the minor orders and the subdiaconate at the same time.

(F. W. H. Wasserschleben†.)

Bibliography: L. Thomassin, *Vetus et nova ecclesiæ disciplina*, I., ii. 35–36; P. Hinschius, *Das Kirchenrecht . . . in Deutschland*, i. 112–113, Berlin, 1869; G. Philips, *Kirchenrecht*, i. 648 sqq., Regensburg, 1881; A. L. Richter, ed. W. Kahl, *Lehrbuch des . . . Kirchenrechts*, p. 364, Leipsic, 1886; E. Friedberg, *Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts*, p. 139, ib. 1895.

INTINCTION. See Eastern Church, III., § 5.

INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLE. See Biblical Introduction.

INTROIT: The name given in the Latin Church to the anthem at the beginning of the communion service. It usually consists of an antiphon, a verse (or more) from a psalm or other portion of Scripture, and the Gloria Patri (see Liturgics, III., § 2). It differs considerably in the different rites in name, contents, and the time of its performance. Numerous forms exist, the Pian Missal alone containing 159. The origin is debated, some ascribing it to Pope Celestine (423 a.d.; cf. *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Mommsen in *MGH*, *Gest. pont. Rom.*, i. 94, 1898), and others to Gregory the Great.

Bibliography: L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, pp. 116–117, 163, 190, 439, London, 1904; *DCA*, i. 865–867.

INVENTION OF THE CROSS. See Cross, Invention (or Finding) of the.

INVESTITURE: In ecclesiastical language, the ceremony of inducting an abbot or bishop into his office. The subject is interesting mainly in connection with a long controversy between the papacy and secular rulers over the right of investiture, which constitutes an important chapter of medieval history.

The Earlier Practise.

Even before the fall of the Roman Empire there are evidences of imperial influence upon the nomination of bishops, going in some cases as far as direct nomination. In the Frankish kingdoms both the Merovingian and Carolingian rulers repeatedly named the bishops in their territories; and even when the election was made by the clergy and people, they either designated the acceptable candidate beforehand, or claimed the right to confirm the election. The influence of the secular power was still more distinctly felt in the case of abbeys erected after the Roman period; the idea of the jurisdiction of a landowner, raised to a higher power in the case of abbeys on royal land, brought it to pass that royal nomination of the abbots was the rule, election by the chapter the exception. To these powers the Othos and the Franconian dynasty held fast. The acquisition by bishops and abbots of large territories and extensive political rights, which reached its height in the tenth and eleventh centuries, created a spiritual aristocracy not less important than the secular, which it was necessary for the kings to keep in hand by retaining the decisive voice in the filling of the offices—a claim which was not then felt to involve any invasion of the essential rights of the Church. In older times the nomination and confirmation had been made by a royal edict; but under the later Carolingians, whether an election had taken place or not, the actual installation was made by a solemn and formal ceremony, including the giving of the sovereign's hand and the taking of an oath by the candidate. After Otho I. the most usual form was the giving to the new bishop or abbot of his predecessor's pastoral staff, to which Henry III. added the delivery of the episcopal ring. The whole ceremony resembled the investiture of a temporal vassal; and since it conveyed not only spiritual, but temporal, jurisdiction, it began in the eleventh century to be designated by the term *investitura*.

The Contest in Germany.

The first determined opposition to the system came from the ecclesiastical reformers of the eleventh century. It was directed primarily against simoniacal bargains, but soon went further. Cardinal Humbert, in his treatise *Adversus simoniacos* (1057–58), came out decisively against lay investiture. In 1059 and 1063 two Roman synods condemned the bestowal of the minor ecclesiastical offices by laymen; in 1060 synods at Vienne and Tours took the same position in regard to bishoprics and abbeys; and in 1068 the filling of the see of Milan gave occasion for these principles to be put into practise. But the first actual clash came when Gregory VII., in the Lent synod of 1075, directly denied the right of the German king to grant investiture, and enforced his denial so vigorously that Henry IV. was obliged to take up the challenge by the attempt to depose Gregory at the Synod of Worms in 1076, thus opening a struggle which lasted for forty-six years. Gregory and his successors maintained their position. The Roman synod of 1080 laid down positive regulations, based upon primitive Christian practise, for the election of bishops by the clergy and people, giving the pope a deciding voice as to the validity of the election. Victor III., Urban II., and Paschal II. reiterated the same views, but had no better success than Gregory in enforcing them against Henry IV. and V. The ultimate solution of the difficulty was prepared rather by the literary discussions, in which a gradual perception appeared of the distinction between the spiritual office and the secular rights. This opened the way to attempts at accommodation. After some failures, efforts led in 1122 to the Concordat of Worms between Henry V. and Calixtus II., which ended the struggle and formed the basis of the later practise until the downfall of the German empire (for provisions see CONCORDATS AND DELIMITING BULLS, I.). Episcopal and abbatial elections were to be conducted in Italy and Burgundy without any royal interference, in Germany in the presence of the king, and with provision for his advisory assistance in contested elections. The agreement was not an unqualified victory for either side, but the papacy in the end profited most by it. After the contested imperial election of 1198 (see INNOCENT III.), the influence of the emperor on elections rapidly declined, while that of the popes, especially under the skilful management of Innocent III., increased in the same proportion.

France.

In France during the eleventh century much the same conditions existed as in Germany; but when the conflict arose it was not made so much a question of principle or conducted with so much bitterness. The French bishops had not so much secular power, nor did they to the same extent constitute a spiritual aristocracy. Again, the king claimed to invest only a part of the bishops and abbots, while the majority were nominated and installed by the great vassals. Speaking generally, the right of nomination was abolished by the beginning of the twelfth century, and free election became the rule; but until the end of the century, and even longer, the kings and some of the local magnates still maintained the right of permitting and of confirming the election, and the kings and some great nobles still conferred secular rights and claimed the revenues of these temporalities during a vacancy.

England.

The reforming party had less success in England. Under the Anglo-Saxon and Danish kings the appointment to bishoprics and the great abbeys was in the king's hands; the Normans introduced investiture and the oath of allegiance. The prohibition of lay investiture by Gregory VII. was inoperative here. It was not until Anselm, in 1101, came back to England a confirmed Gregorian and refused the oath of allegiance that there was any real investiture controversy there. It ended in 1107 by the king's renouncing the formality of investiture with ring and staff, but retaining the oath of allegiance and the other rights of his predecessors. In spite of Stephen's promise that bishops and abbots should be canonically elected, the assent of the English kings continued the decisive factor. The English clergy did not win the right of absolutely free election even at a later period, while Innocent III. (q.v.) forced King John to allow the papacy to share the royal influence. (SIEGFRIED RIETSCHEL.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For Germany consult: F. A. Staudenmaier, *Geschichte der Bischofswahlen*, Mainz, 1830; H. Gerdes, *Die Bischofswahlen in Deutschland*, Göttingen, 1878; P. Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, ii. 530 sqq., Berlin, 1878; F. Franziss, *Der deutsche Episcopat . . . 1039–56*, Regensburg, 1879–80; R. Reese, *Die staatsrechtliche Stellung der Bischöfe Burgunds und Italiens unter Friedrich I.*, Göttingen, 1885; C. Mirbt, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII.*, pp. 463 sqq., Leipsic, 1894; E. Friedberg, *Kirchenrecht*, pp. 312 sqq., ib. 1895; C. Willing, *Zur Geschichte des Investiturstreits*, Liegnitz, 1896; A. Hauck, *KD*, vol. iii. For France: A. Cauchie, *La Querelle des investitures dans les diocèses de Liége et de Cambrai*, Louvain, 1890–91; P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les Élections épiscopales . . . ix.–xii. siècles*, Paris, 1891; A. Luchaire, *Hist. des institutions monarchiques de la France . . . (987–1180)*, ii. 68 sqq., ib. 1891; P. Viollet, *Hist. des institutions politiques et administratives de la France*, ii. 317 sqq., Paris, 1898. For England: E. A. Freeman, *Reign of William Rufus*, London, 1882; M. Schmitz, *Der englische Investiturstreit*, Innsbruck, 1884; W. Hunt, *The English Church . . . (597–1066)*, London, 1899; W. R. W. Stephens, *The English Church . . . (1066–1272)*, pp. 119–131 et passim, ib. 1901; J. Drehmann, *Papst Leo. IX. und die Simonie. Beitrag zur Untersuchung der Vorgeschichte des Investiturstreits*, Leipsic, 1908. Consult also W. E. Addis, *Catholic Dictionary*, pp. 497–498, London, 1903; *KL*, vi. 844–863; and the literature under the articles on the popes named in the text and under ANSELM.

IONA: An island of the Inner Hebrides, off the west coast of Scotland, separated from the Ross of Mull by Iona Sound. It forms a part of Argyllshire, and lies from 35 to 40 miles to the westward of Oban, from which it is reached by steamer. The name should be Ioua, the form with n having arisen from a mistaken reading of u. In Irish it occurs as *I-Columcille*, "the Island of Columba." The popular name at present is *Eecholuim-cille*. The island is about three and a half miles long from northeast to southwest, and from a mile to a mile and a half in breadth. It is rocky and sandy, with boggy hollows between the hills, the highest of which rises to 330 feet. Its area is estimated at from 1,600 to 2,000 acres, less than half of it arable, and not more than a third actually under cultivation. The pastures on the sides of the knolls and ravines support a few hundred sheep and a smaller number of cattle. The population in 1901 was 213, engaged in agriculture and fishing.

Iona owes its fame to its association with Columba and the monastery founded there by him in 563. The Irish annals state that the island was given to him by his kinsman, Conall, king of the Dalriad Scots. Bede, however, says he received it from the Picts as a result of his successful missionary labor among them. Bede's statement is the more probable, but possibly both accounts are true, as Iona was debatable ground between the Scots and the Picts. For Columba's work there and the earlier history of the monastery, see the articles COLUMBA; CELTIC CHURCH IN BRITAIN AND IRELAND; ADAMNAN. The island was repeatedly ravaged by the Danes during the ninth and tenth centuries; on one of these occasions (806) sixty-eight monks suffered martyrdom. The ruined buildings were restored again and again with remarkable pertinacity. Between 814 and 831 the monastery was rebuilt with stone and a shrine was erected to St. Columba. In 878 the shrine and relics were taken to Ireland. Queen Margaret rebuilt the monastery between 1059 and 1093. A Benedictine abbey and nunnery were established in the island in 1203. The remains still existing date mostly from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, although the chapel of St. Oran (*Odhrain*) may be of the time of Queen Margaret. It is of red granite, and has as its western doorway a Norman arch with beak-headed ornament, and stands in the *Reilig Odhrain*, the ancient burial-place of the monastery, said also to have been the burial-place of the Scottish and Pictish kings till the time of Malcolm III. (d. 1093), as well as of certain English, Irish, and Norwegian kings. North of this cemetery are the remains of the thirteenth-century Benedictine abbey. In connection with the cloisters is a Norman arcade of somewhat older date. The Church of St. Mary, commonly called the Cathedral, dates probably from the thirteenth century. It is built of red granite, in cruciform shape, with nave, transept, and choir, and has a central tower seventy-five feet in height.

Bibliography: Besides the authorities mentioned under Columba, Culdees, especially Reeves (1857), pp. 334–369, 413–433, consult: L. Maclean, *A Historical Account of Iona*, Edinburgh, 1833; C. A. and J. C. Buckless, *The Cathedral or Abbey Church of Iona*, London, 1866 (drawings with descriptive letterpress and an account of the early Celtic Church and the mission of St. Columba by A. Ewing, Bishop of Iona and the Isles); the Duke of Argyll, *Iona*, London, 1870; J. Drummond, *Sculptured Monuments in Iona and the West Highlands*, Edinburgh, 1881; J. Healy, *Insula Sanctorum*, pp. 291–363, Dublin, 1890; W. Bright, *Chapters of Early English Church History*, passim, Oxford, 1897; A. Macmillan, *Iona, its History and Antiquities*, London, 1898.

IRELAND.

I. The Roman Catholic Church.
II. The Church of Ireland.
III. Other Protestant Bodies.
IV. History.

Ireland, a large island west of Great Britain, and since 1801 an integral part of the United Kingdom, has an area of 31,790 square miles, and a population (1901) of 4,458,775. It is divided into four provinces: Ulster in the north, Leinster in the east, Munster in the south, and Connaught in the west. The census report of 1901 includes statistics of 309 religious professions, the most important of which are Roman Catholics, 3,308,661; Church of Ireland, 581,089; Presbyterians, 443,276; Methodists, 62,006; Congregationalists or Independents, 10,142; Unitarians, 8,094; Baptists, 7,062; Reformed Presbyterians, 6,532; Jews, 3,898; "Brethren," 3,742; United Free Church of Scotland, 3,147; Friends, 2,731; and "Christians," 2,631.

I. The Roman Catholic Church: The organization of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland is as follows: archbishopric of Armagh (corresponding to Ulster; founded 455), with the suffragan bishoprics of Ardagh (before 458; united to Clonmacnoise 1729, which was founded before 549), Clogher (506), Derry (1158), Down (499; united to Connor 1442, which was founded 1174), Dromore (c. 510), Kilmore (1136), Meath (520), and Raphoe (885); archbishopric of Dublin (corresponding to Leinster; before 618; raised to archbishopric 1152; united to Glendalough 1215), with the suffragan bishoprics of Ferns (before 632), Kildare (before 519; later united to Leighlin, which was founded 626), and Ossory (538); archbishopric of Cashel (corresponding to Munster, before 458; raised to archbishopric 1152; united to Emly 1562, which was founded before 527), with the suffragan bishoprics of Cloyne (before 604; united to Ross 1430, but separated from it 1849), Cork (606), Kerry and Aghadoe (before 1075), Killaloe (c. 640), Limerick (1106); Ross (before 1172), Waterford (1096; united to Lismore 1363, which was founded 633); and archbishopric of Tuam (corresponding to Connaught, 540; raised to archbishopric 1152; united to Enachdune 1484, which was founded in the seventh century; united to Majo 1578, which was founded 665), with the suffragan bishoprics of Achonry (before 1152), Clonfert (558), Elphin (c. 450), Galway (1831; later united to Kilmacduagh and Kilfenora, which were founded before 620), and Killala (sixth century). The above dates are taken from P. B. Gams, *Series Episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae* (Regensburg, 1872), and in many cases are too early. Authorities differ considerably.

The Roman Catholics maintain 2,420 churches with 3,543 priests, 97 monasteries and 270 nunneries. The elementary schools are for the most part entrusted to the Christian Brethren; each diocese has a seminary for boys; there are besides colleges at Thurles, Waterford, Kilkenny, and Carlow. At Maynooth is situated the College of St. Patrick, and in Dublin, University College. The Catholic University of Ireland consists at present of colleges at Dublin, Maynooth, Blackrock, Carlow, and Clonliffe.

II. The Church of Ireland: This body, before 1871 the established church in Ireland, has two archbishoprics, Armagh, corresponding in a rough way to Ulster and Connaught, and Dublin, corresponding to Leinster and Munster. There are thirteen bishoprics, including the archbishoprics. At the census of 1901 there were 1,617 clergy. The head university for the Church of Ireland is Trinity College, Dublin (founded 1591); there is also Queen's University (founded 1850), with three colleges at Belfast, Cork, and Galway, which are each under the government of a dean. These colleges also have foundations for the Presbyterians and the Wesleyan Methodists. The property of the church is administered by the representative body, consisting of the archbishops and bishops, thirteen clerical and twenty-six lay representatives, also thirteen coöptated members, who can be either clergy or laymen. In their care are all the churches, together with the churchyards, and also the schoolhouses. They also take charge of the payment of all the officials and servants of the church. The government of the church is entrusted to the general synod, which is composed of three classes, the bishops, the clergy, and the laity, which form two houses, the house of bishops, thirteen in number, and the house of representatives, with 208 clerical and 416 lay members. The representatives are chosen every three years. The synod meets yearly in Dublin, but extraordinary meetings may be summoned. Each diocese has also its own synod, which meets at least once a year. These synods are also chosen every three years. The church is divided into parishes, every church with a clergyman and registered vestrymen counting as a parish. Every diocesan synod chooses two clergymen and one layman, who, with the bishop, form a committee of patronage. Each parish on its side names every three years three parochial nominators. When a vacancy occurs in a pastorate the two aforesaid bodies meet together and form a board of nominators, who elect the new incumbent. When a bishopric becomes vacant the archbishop of the province calls together the synod of the diocese, who vote by ballot for a successor. The bishop of the diocese appoints the dean, the canons, the deacons, and the other officers of the cathedral. The collegiate and cathedral church of St. Patrick in Dublin was made the national cathedral (May, 1872), and stands in the same relation to all the dioceses. There are two kinds of spiritual courts of justice, the diocesan courts, and the court of the general synod. A diocesan court consists of the bishop, the chancellor, who is appointed for life, and two members of the synod, one from the clergy and one from the laity. These men choose for five years three clerical and three lay co-members. The court of the general synod consists of one of the archbishops, who alternate with each other, one bishop, and three lay judges. Three additional members are chosen from the general synod. The constitutions and canons of the church are like those of the Church of England.

III. Other Protestant Bodies: The Presbyterians are found chiefly in Ulster, about ninety-six per cent. of them being in that province. The largest body, the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, numbers 36 presbyteries, 647 ministers, and 569 congregations with 106,342 communicants. In the Sunday Schools there are 8,354 teachers and 97,647 scholars. The church administers two theological colleges, with fourteen professors. The Baptist Union of Ireland numbered, in 1908, 2,980 members, and had 39 churches and 40 chapels. The Wesleyan Methodist Church gave as the number of their members in 1907, 28,826; they had 133 stations in ten districts. See articles on the separate denominations.

IV. History: For the early history of the church in Ireland see Celtic Church in Britain and Ireland. At the time of the Reformation, during the reign of Henry VIII., an attempt was made to correct some of the abuses of the church in Ireland, but the Reformation did not meet with much popular favor, owing in a large measure to fear that only the English language could be used in church. Through the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth various attempts were made to introduce the English liturgy, and the government proceeded with great severity against the Roman Catholics. Under Mary there was a reaction in favor of the Roman Catholics. At the accession of James I. the Roman Catholics, thinking that he favored them, tried to expel the Protestants from the island. The king, however, suppressed the attempts, confiscating the estates of many Roman Catholics, especially in Ulster, and settling Scotch Presbyterians in their place. During the Civil War and the Commonwealth, as also during the reign of Charles I., there were many rebellions and consequent suppressions of the Roman Catholics in Ireland. At the Revolution the Roman Catholics were filled with hope, and many Protestants had to flee the country. William III., however, finally completed the conquest of Ireland, and from that epoch until recent times the Roman Catholics were discriminated against in many ways. Gradually, however, the restrictions against them have been removed. Just as the Roman Catholics were discriminated against, so the Protestant Church, as the state church, was granted many favors. These have been done away with from time to time, and at last, July 26, 1869, the Irish Church Act was passed, taking effect Jan. 1, 1871. This act disestablished the church and dissolved its union with the Church of England. Compensation was made for all vested interests, including even the annual grants for the Roman Catholic college at Maynooth and the *Regium Donum* granted to the Presbyterians by James I.

Bibliography: For the early history see Celtic Church in Britain and Ireland and the literature given there. For recent data consult the *Irish Clergy List* (annual); *The Irish Catholic Directory* (annual); and the *Year Books* of the English bodies which carry on work in Ireland. Consult further: H. Seddall, *The Church of Ireland*, Dublin, 1886; J. T. Ball, *Fingal and its Churches*, Dublin, 1888; idem, *The Reformed Church of Ireland*, London, 1890; R. Walsh, *Fingal and its Churches*, Dublin, 1888; T. Olden, *The Church of Ireland*, London, 1892; M. J. F. McCarthy, *Rome in Ireland*, ib. 1904; M. O'Riordan, *Catholicity and Progress in Ireland*, Dublin, 1905; M. J. F. McCarthy, *Priests and People in Ireland*, London, 1908.

IRELAND, JOHN: Church of England, dean of Westminster; b. at Ashburton (20 m. n.e. of Plymouth), England, Sept. 8, 1761; d. at Westminster Sept. 2, 1842. He studied at the free grammar-school of Ashburton, and at Oriel College, Oxford (B.A., 1783; M.A., 1810; B. D. and D.D., 1810). After serving a small curacy near Ashburton for a short period, he traveled on the continent as private tutor; was vicar of Croydon, and reader and chaplain to the earl of Liverpool, 1793–1816; held a prebend in Westminster Abbey, 1802; became subdean as well as theological lecturer, 1806; and dean, 1816. He was rector at Islip in Oxfordshire, and dean of the Order of the Bath, 1816–35. Acquiring considerable wealth, he used it with great generosity, founding scholarships at Oxford and prizes at Westminster School, and furthering free education. He held the crown at the coronations of George IV. and William IV. He left sums for a new church at Westminster, and for a new professorship at Oxford. He was the author of *Five Discourses, containing certain Arguments for and against the Reception of Christianity by the ancient Jews and Greeks* (London, 1796); *Paganism and Christianity Compared, in a Course of Lectures to the King's Scholars at Westminster, in the Years 1806–07–08* (1809); and *The Plague of Marseilles in . . . 1720* (1834).

IRENAEUS.

Life (§ 1).
His Principal Literary Work, "Against Heresies" (§ 2).
Other Writings (§ 3).
His Theology and Polity (§ 4).
His Position as a Practical Churchman (§ 5).

Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, is the most important witness to ecclesiastical tradition before Eusebius.

1. Life. He came originally from Asia Minor, which was connected in many ways with the Church of Gaul, and died after 190. Little that is certain is known about him until 177, in which year the imprisoned confessors of Lyons chose him as the bearer of a letter to Eleutherus of Rome concerning the Montanist controversy. If the fact that the confessors call him not only their brother, but their "companion," is partly a reminiscense of Rev. i. 9, it still seems probable that he did not wholly escape the persecution; and it may have been a design to save his valuable life that inspired the choice of him to go to Rome. He had probably then been a presbyter of the church at Lyons for several years, since immediately after his return he was chosen bishop, to succeed Pothinus, who had perished in the persecution. In this capacity he wrote his principal work about 185, and sent a letter about 190 to Victor of Rome, who had broken off communion with the churches of Asia Minor over the Quartodeciman controversy, as well as to other bishops. There is no further definite knowledge of his later years. Jerome is the first to mention him as a martyr, and then only incidentally, and not improbably on the basis of the expression quoted above from the letter of the confessors. Hippolytus, Tertullian, Eusebius, and other writers who would have been likely to mention the fact of his martyrdom, say nothing about it. There has been a prolonged controversy, which is still unsettled, as to the date of his birth and the length of his life. While Bodwell, Grabe, and more recently Zahn have put his birth near the beginning of the second century, Massuet, Lipsius, Ziegler, and Harnack have attempted to fix it near the middle. It must be remembered that the date of the death of Polycarp is now practically settled for 155. The principal data may be briefly summarized as follows: If Irenaeus became bishop in 177, he must have been at least forty, and was therefore probably born before 137 rather than after. His implication (V., xxx. 3) that the Apocalypse was written " almost in his own lifetime " is, all things considered, irreconcilable with the theory that he was born forty or fifty years after the probable date of its composition (before the death of Domitian in 96). Again, in his letter to Florinus (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, V., xx. 5), he speaks of having seen him at Smyrna in the emperor's train when he himself was still but a boy. Now, for various reasons, this emperor must have been Hadrian, who visited Asia Minor in 123 and 129, in the latter of which years the meeting must have taken place. All that Irenaeus tells of his recollections of Polycarp at this period shows that he must have been at least twelve or fifteen, and thus was probably born about 115. He implies distinctly that his intercourse with and instruction by Polycarp lasted for a number of years, very likely from about 129 to 150; and the same conclusion follows from what he tells of the teaching received in Asia Minor from certain disciples of the apostles. After all necessary sifting has been applied to the passages referring to this, there remain two (IV., xxvii. 1–32 and V., xxxiii. 3, 4) which can be understood only as asserting that he had this oral instruction from more than one of such disciples, and when he was of an age to take it in and be deeply impressed by it. Neither he nor any tradition mentions the reaching of an unusually great age by any member of this group except Polycarp; if the others died considerably earlier, say before 145, he must before that date have been of an age to profit by their teaching. Finally, in an appendix to the *Martyrium Polycarpi* (found in a manuscript at Moscow), which is almost certainly written by the Pionius (q.v.) who was the author of a *Vita Polycarpi* before 400, the statement is found, based upon Irenaeus's own works, that he was teaching in Rome at the time of the death of Polycarp, and that a voice like a trumpet told him, at the very hour, of the decease of his master in Smyrna. Whatever may be thought of this last assertion, there is no reason to doubt the general statement; and the account which he himself gives of Polycarp's visit to Rome in 154 evidently comes from one who was there himself at the time. The chronological results indicated above may thus be taken as fairly established.

2. His Principal Literary Work, "Against Heresies."

It is impossible to assign all of Irenaeus's multifarious literary activity to the different periods of his life as long as so much of his work is lost. His principal work is the " Refutation and Subversion of knowledge Falsely so Called," generally referred to as " Against Heresies." It consists of five books, and is preserved in its entirety only in a Latin version, the date of which requires further investigation; there is sufficient evidence that the original was still extant in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. There are, however, long extracts in the original Greek in Epiphanius, numerous smaller quotations in other writers, and considerable portions incorporated without acknowledgment in the " Refutation " of Hippolytus. The occasion of the work was given by the official position of Irenaeus at Lyons. Some disciples of Marcus, who himself belonged to the school of Valentinus, had come into the Rhône country, and the Church of that region was troubled by the writings of Florinus, the Roman presbyter who had embraced the Valentinian teachings. The immediate cause of the work was the request of a friend and colleague at a distance for precise information about these same teachings and help in refuting them. The work was not originally intended to be so large; but it grew under his hand. Even in its present extent, it does not fully carry out the plan promised; and Grabe's hypothesis that the complete work is not extant is not without foundation, especially since the present conclusion of v. 32 is wanting in some Latin manuscripts. With great clearness of thought and expression, Irenaeus takes no trouble in the main outline to keep within the narrow bounds of a preconceived plan, but allows himself to be carried swiftly forward by the current of his thought. There is no attempt at literary art; the subject is everything to him. Although he is prepared to find a wide circle of readers, he writes in the first instance for his brother in the faith. The latter was chiefly concerned with the teaching of Valentinus, and it is this which accordingly occupies the leading place, both in the exposition and the refutation. Others, however, are touched on and traced back to their sources, as far as Simon Magus; and the doctrines of Valentinus can not be controverted without at least incidental discussion of the contemporary one of Marcion. For his facts he depends not only upon his personal intercourse with disciples of Valentinus, but also upon their writings, which he sometimes quotes verbally, but more often summarizes freely. He is acquainted with the older church treatises against heresy, but is dissatisfied with their insufficient knowledge of the Valentinian position; in his treatment of other heresies, he may have borrowed from these treatises to some extent, as he quotes incidentally from Justin's treatise against Marcion and from a polemical poem directed against Marcus.

3. Other Writings.

Of a considerable number of other works of Irenaeus what is known is gathered from scattered citations in Eusebius and others. They may be briefly enumerated as follows: (1) An admonition to Florinus "On the Divine Sovereignty, or God not the Author of Evil," written when Florinus was still in the communion of the Church, for he is warned that his teachings are irreconcilable with its doctrine, and that "not even heretics outside the Church have ventured to assert such things." (2) A "Treatise on the Ogdoad," occasioned by Florinus, but not addressed to him. The loss of this work is specially regrettable, since Irenaeus seems in it to have dwelt in detail on his relation to the first post-apostolic generation. (3) An epistle to a certain Blastus in Rome "On Schism." According to the pseudo-Tertullian this man was a Quartodeciman, according to Pacian a Greek by birth and a Montanist. (4) Among, or connected with, the letters which Irenaeus wrote to various bishops at the time of the paschal controversy may be placed that which, according to a Syriac fragment, "he wrote to an Alexandrian, showing that it was right to celebrate the feast of the Resurrection on Sunday." (5) The letter to Victor of Rome concerning this same controversy. (6) A letter "On Faith" to Demetrius, a deacon of Vienne. (7) According to Eusebius (v. 26), an apology, addressed to the Greeks, "On Knowledge." (8) A treatise, mentioned in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, V. xxvi., dedicated to a certain Marcianus, possibly the author of the *Martyrium Polycarpi*, on the apostolic preaching. [This work, which is of the nature of a dogmatic discussion of the apostolic teaching, and is quite an extensive work, has been discovered in Armenian translation in the Church of the Mother of God in Eriwan, and edited with German translation by Ter-Mekerttschian and Ter-Minassiantz in *TU*, xxxi. 1 (1907). The manuscript dates from the second half of the thirteenth century, and contains about two-thirds of the entire work. From what language the translation was made is not clear, but Syriac is indicated.] (9) A book of various discourses. (10) Oecumenius gives an extract from a work in which Irenaeus is supposed to relate the martyrdom of Sanctus and Blandina. Allowing for a confusion of Blandina and Biblias, this agrees with the letter of the church of Lyons on the martyrdoms of 177, of which he may well have been the author, though Eusebius (V., xiv.–xix. 25) did not think it necessary to mention the fact. (11) A treatise against the theory that matter is eternal. The exposition of Canticles, of which a Syriac fragment exists, is of doubtful authenticity, while the four fragments published in 1715 by Pfaff, chancellor of Tübingen, have been finally shown by Harnack to be forgeries of Pfaff's. It is not known whether Irenaeus carried out his intention (expressed III., xii. 12) of writing a special treatise against Marcion.

4. His Theology and Polity.

The extent and variety of the interests of which a glimpse has been given renders it impossible to attempt here a complete exposition of the theology and church polity of Irenaeus. It is unfortunate that, outside of scanty fragments, only a single polemical work of his is extant, and that for the most part not in the original. Here he appears as a stout defender of church doctrine against Gnosticism. If he is compared with the other members of the school to which he belonged, with Papias or with Polycarp, the manner appears striking in which he combines with firm adhesion to the faith of these simple men a remarkable accessibility to the most varied elements of culture that were within his reach. He makes no parade of secular learning; he declines to be a teacher of "barbaric philosophy" like other apologists from Aristides to Clement; but he surpasses them all in soundness of judgment, acuteness of perception, and clearness of exposition. In fact, he is the first writer of the post-apostolic period who deserves the title of a theologian. In pure theology he stands far above Athanasius and Cyril, and can be compared only with Origen and Augustine. The balanced security of his attitude is remarkable. When the Phrygian peasants disturbed first the scene of his early years, and then the whole Church with their fanatical prophecies and their preaching of a gloomy penance, he did not lose his head. In union with the Church of Lyons and its imprisoned confessors, he warned Eleutherus of Rome not to condemn without examination a religious movement which linked itself to the age of the apostles by valuable inheritances. When the Alogi, in opposition to Montanism, attempted to banish from the Church all prophecy, and the Apocalypse with it, he took a firm stand against them; but he did not become a Montanist. Again, in his judgment of the pagan polity, he did not desert the line marked out by Christ himself and by Paul, and followed (as he points out) by John in the Apocalypse. The Roman Empire is to him no more Antichrist than the world and the flesh necessarily belong to the devil.

5. His Position as a Practical Churchman.

As a practical churchman he was no less admirable than as a theologian. His sermons are lost; but that a collection of them should have been in existence 150 years after his death is enough to show that he deserves a prominent place in the history of homiletics. He learned Celtic in order to speak to the heathen about Lyons, and thus has a place also in the history of missionary effort. His devotion to the immediate duties of his restricted and outlying diocese did not prevent him from having much at heart the welfare of the Church at large, from feeling at home in Rome or Ephesus. His evident love for the ancient Church of his native home did not blind him to the special significance and vocation of the Church at Rome, based upon the position and history of the city. In the paschal controversy he deserted the traditional custom of the Church of his boyhood, because he saw that the Western practise was more appropriate to the essential center-point of the Easter celebration; but he stood out firmly against over-emphasizing such differences, and against the combined ignorance and assumption of Pope Victor. The unity of the Church, for whose sake he prizes the tradition carried on by the episcopal succession in the great apostolic churches, is according to him perfectly consistent with large freedom and diversity in ecclesiastical customs and with mutual independence of the autonomous bodies which compose the universal Church. After the perversion of doctrine by the Gnostics, he saw the greatest peril to this unity in a rigidity that strove for constrained uniformity, whether it manifested itself in the refusal of the Quartodeciman Blastus to yield in Rome to the prevalent custom in regard to Easter, or in the attitude of the Roman bishop, with whom he nevertheless agreed. Polemical theologian though he was, he yet verified his name (Irenaeus, "Peaceful") by seeking the peace of the Church amid all his controversies. His actual influence upon the development of the Church was greater than that of perhaps any other teacher of the first three centuries. He did much to protect it, first against the dissolution threatened by the Valentinian speculations, which came in largely under the cover of external conformity; then against provincial narrow-mindedness and ignorant fanaticism; and finally against the ambition of the Roman see to grasp at a despotic universal monarchy. (T. ZAHN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best modern edition of the Works of Irenæus is by W. Wigan Harvey, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1877, and perhaps the next best is by A. Stieren, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1853. The *editio princeps* is by Erasmus, Basel, 1526 (often reprinted, contains the Lat. version of the *Adv. haer.*). Succeeding editions were by N. Gallasius, Paris, 1570 (the first edition with the fragments of the Greek); F. Feuardent, Cologne, 1596 and later; J. E. Grabe, Oxford, 1702 (one of the best); the Benedictine edition of R. Massuet, Paris, 1712 and Venice, 1734 (also exceedingly good). Vol. iii. of the *Oxyrhyncus Papyri* by Grenfell and Hunt issued by the Egypt Exploration Fund for 1902–03 contains fragments, on which cf. E. Nestle in the Munich *Allgemeine Zeitung*, no. 249. Note also *Eisepideixin tou apostolou kērugmatos, in armenischer Version entdeckt*, ed. K. Ter-Mekerttschian and E. Ter-Minassiantz, in *TU*, xxxi (1907; cf. § 3, no. 8 above).

On the life of Irenaeus and various phases of his activities and works consult: the introductions to the various editions of his works; *DCB*, iii. 253–279 (elaborate and well worth consulting); H. Dodwell, *Dissertationes in Irenaeum*, Oxford, 1689; J. Alexander, *The Primitive Doctrine of Christ's Divinity*, London, 1727; E. Burton, *Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ*, pp. 68–111, Oxford, 1826; J. Beaven, *Life and Writings of St. Irenaeus*, London, 1841; L. Duncker, *Des heiligen Irenäus Christologie*, Göttingen, 1843; K. Graul, *Die christliche Kirche an der Schwelle des irenäischen Zeitalters*, Leipsic, 1860; H. Ziegler, *Des Irenäus Lehre von der Autorität der Schrift, der Tradition und der Kirche*, Berlin, 1868; idem, *Irenäus der Bischof von Lyon*, ib. 1871; R. A. Lipsius, *Die Zeit des Irenäus und die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, Munich, 1872; H. L. Mansel, *Gnostic Heresies*, London, 1875; J. B. Lightfoot, in *Contemporary Review*, Aug., 1876; A. Gilloud, *S. Irenée et son temps*, Lyon, 1876; C. J. H. Ropes, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Apr., 1877 (deals with the nationality of Irenaeus); E. Montet, *La Légende d'Irenée*, Geneva, 1880; C. E. Freppel, *S. Irenée et l'éloquence chrétienne dans la Gaule*, Paris, 1886; F. W. Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers*, i. 67–93, New York, 1889; J. Werner, *Der Paulinismus des Irenäus*, in *TU*, vi. 2, 1889; J. Kunze, *Die Gotteslehre des Irenäus*, Leipsic, 1891; idem, *De historiae gnosticismi fontibus*, ib. 1894; T. Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Kanons*, iv. 247–283, ib. 1891; A. Camerlynck, *S. Irenée et le canon du N. T.*, Paris, 1896; A. Harnack, *Die Pfaff'schen Irenäus Fragmente*, in *TU*, xx. 3, 1900; idem, *Litteratur*, consult the Index (very full); idem, *Dogma*, passim, consult the Index; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, i. 495–519, ii. 537, 543–544; Neander, *Christian Church*, i. 679–682 et passim; Schaff, *Christian Church*, ii. 746 sqq.; Moeller, *Christian Church*, i. 106, 158, 199 sqq.; and the Church histories of the period.

IRENAEUS, CHRISTOPH: Follower of Matthias Flacius (q.v.); b. at Schweidnitz (31 m. s.w. of Breslau), Silesia, c. 1522; d. probably at Buchenbach (between Hall and Rothenburg-on-the-Tauber), Württemberg, c. 1595. From May, 1544, he studied at Wittenberg, where he was enrolled as Christofferus Harem. After being rector of schools at Bernburg (1545–47) and Aschersleben, he became M. A. at Wittenberg, Feb. 14, 1549. Late in 1552 he became deacon and was ordained by Bugenhagen. In 1559 he became archdeacon, and began his very extensive activity as theological author about this time. In the spring of 1562 he was called as pastor to Eisleben. Here, as a strict Lutheran, he was highly esteemed by the counts of Mansfeld and the congregation, and became acquainted with the followers of Flacius. In 1566 John William of Saxony called him to be court preacher, first in Coburg, then in Weimar. Irenäus utilized this appointment to obtain positions for the Flacians at the university, in the Church, and in the chancery, and advocated the doctrine of Flacius at the Altenburg Colloquy, Oct. 21, 1568–Mar. 9, 1569. Mörlin, Chemnitz, and Jakob Andreæ tried in vain to win him from Flacius. When the Evangelical princes complained of the Flacians in 1570, Irenäus was transferred as superintendent to Neustadt-on-the-Orla, but persisted in his usual way, and when menaced with an investigation, escaped to Mansfeld in 1572. His old friends did not stand by him, and Archbishop Sigismund of Magdeburg now intervened. Irenäus eluded his soldiers, Dec. 31, 1574, and thenceforth traversed Germany as an "exile for Christ." Though seven times banished before 1590, he continued striving with unbroken courage, and above all opposed the Formula of Concord, its authors, subscribers, and defenders. In 1575 he was expelled from his native town, whereupon he sojourned in Hesse and along the Lower Rhine. In 1579 he was at Frankfort, and finally found refuge with Eberhard of Stetten at Buchenbach. Count Wolfgang of Hohenlohe constrained him to a colloquy with Andreä, at Langenburg, Aug. 6, 1581, and then insisted upon his withdrawal from Buchenbach. At the close of 1582, he obtained a call to the Lower Austrian Church at Horn, but on Aug. 12, 1585, the Flacians one and all were notified of their discharge. Irenäus returned to Buchenbach, and occupied himself with literary work. He was a noble, talented, and learned man, but a classic example of the *rabies theologorum* which converts a single article of Christian faith into a central dogma, as he did with the doctrine of Flacius on original sin. His best strength was spent in vituperation and railing, and, in his inequity of judgment he was even carried into falsehood, so that his best book, *Der Spiegel des ewigen Lebens* (1572), loses thereby in value. G. BOSSERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: B. Raupach, *Evangelisches Oesterreich, nebst Presbyterologia Austriaca*, pp. 69–73, and *Nachtrag, Zwiefache Zugabe*, p. 43, 3 vols., Hamburg, 1741–44 (the best biography, containing also a useful bibliography); J. G. Leuckfeld, *Hist. Spangenbergensis*, pp. 37–38, Quedlinburg, 1716; W. Preger, *Matthias Flacius Illyricus und seine Zeit*, 2 vols., Erlangen, 1859–61; *ZHT*, xix (1850), 3 sqq., 218 sqq.; *ADB*, xiv. 582.

IRENE: Byzantine empress; b. at Athens 752; d. in Lesbos Aug. 9, 803. In 769 she married Leo, afterward Leo IV., and, upon his death in 780, she became regent during the minority of Constantine VI. The first years of her regency were marked by disastrous wars against the Arabians, to whom she was forced to pay annual tribute. In the iconoclastic controversies of the time (see IMAGES AND IMAGE-WORSHIP, II.) she had secretly been favorable to images even during Leo's lifetime, and after his death she set herself to reverse the iconoclastic legislation of Constantine V. Accordingly, having gained control of the Eastern Church by judicious appointments to bishoprics, she called the seventh ecumenical council to meet at Constantinople in 786. Owing to the iconoclastic zeal of the soldiers here the council was transferred to Nicæa in 787, and image-worship was then reestablished without opposition (see NICÆA, COUNCILS OF). In 790 the government was wrested from Irene by her son, Constantine VI., but by 792 she was again in power, ruling conjointly with Constantine. After five years of secret warfare between mother and son, Irene finally gained the upper hand and had Constantine blinded and thrown into a dungeon in 797. Her own extravagant reign came to an end in 802, when she was overthrown by Nicephorus and banished to the Isle of Lesbos. Here she earned a meager living by spinning. At the time of her fall she was negotiating a marriage with Charlemagne, with a view to uniting the Eastern with the Western Empire. Her services in the interest of image-worship won her the position of a saint in the Greek Church. Her day is Aug. 15.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, v. 191–192; *KL*, vi. 873; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 99, 964–965, 1074; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xii. 135–136, xiii. 619, 628.

IRION, PAUL: German Evangelical Synod; b. near Marthasville, Mo., Oct. 28, 1860. He was educated at Blackburn University, Carlinville, Ill. (1873–75), Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. (1875–76), Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill. (A.B., 1879), and Missouri College, near Marthasville, Mo. (1882). In 1882 he was ordained to the ministry, and after being assistant pastor of St. John's Evangelical Church, Michigan City, Ind., from March to June, 1882, and of Bethel Evangelical Church, Freedom Township, Mich., from June to Nov., 1882, then full pastor, and is now pastor of St. John's, Michigan City, Ind. From 1888 to 1895 he was secretary of the Michigan district of his denomination, of which he is, theologically, an orthodox member, and in 1890 was the official compiler of the census for the Evangelical Synod. He has also been president of the Michigan district of the German Evangelical Synod since 1895.

IRISH ARTICLES: The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England were not introduced in Ireland till the time of Charles I. In their place a shorter collection of eleven articles was published in 1566 by authority of the deputy and the archbishops and bishops. At the first convocation of the Irish Episcopal Church (1613–15) a series of 104 articles was adopted and approved by the deputy in 1615, which was probably composed by James Ussher, then at the head of the theological faculty in Dublin (afterward archbishop of Armagh). They are important as proving the decided Calvinism of the Irish Church at that time, and still more so as the connecting link between the Thirty-nine Articles and the Westminster Confession, and as the chief source of the latter, "as is evident from the general order, the headings of chapters and subdivisions, and the almost literal agreement of language in the statement of several of the most important doctrines." By a decree of the convocation, the teaching of any doctrine contrary to these articles was forbidden. But the Irish convocation of 1635, under the lead of the Earl of Strafford, lord-lieutenant of Ireland, and his chaplain, John Bramhall, formally adopted the Thirty-nine Articles, and quietly ignored the others. Archbishop Ussher required subscription to both. Eventually, however, the Irish articles were lost sight of, and no mention was made of them, when, in the beginning of the nineteenth century, the United Church of England and Ireland was organized.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, i. 662–665, iii. 526–544, New York, 1877; T. Olden, *The Church of Ireland*, 323–324, 342–344, 352–354, London, 1892.

IRISH SISTERS OF CHARITY. See ENGLISH LADIES.

IRREGULARITY: In canon law, a defect or impediment which excludes a person otherwise qualified from due reception or exercise of holy orders. Canonists divide these into two classes, irregularities through defect and through fault. Under the former come (1) those through natal defects, affecting all who are not born of a legitimate or at least a putative marriage, and removable by subsequent legitimation or by taking monastic vows. (2) Through bodily defects, affecting those whom illness or mutilation has rendered incapable of performing sacred functions, or of performing them without lowering the dignity of the office or giving offense to the people. (3) Through defects in age, when the canonical age (q.v.) has not been attained. (4) Through defects in knowledge, when the requisite knowledge for the order in question is lacking. (5) Through defects of faith, affecting neophytes and those not yet confirmed, who are presumably insufficiently established in the faith. (6) Through sacramental defects, arising from certain conditions in regard to a previous marriage of the candidate. (7) *Ex defectu perfectae lenitatis*, attaching to those who (though in a lawful way) have contributed to the death or maiming of a fellow-man, such as soldiers, criminal judges, prosecutors, jurymen, or witnesses, but not physicians and surgeons. (8) Through defects in reputation. (9) Through defects in the matter of liberty, preventing the ordination of slaves without their masters' consent, married men without that of their wives, or guardians and trustees before release from their obligations. Irregularity through faults occurs as a consequence of criminal acts publicly known or proved before a court, or of certain misdeeds, even if not known; the latter include the killing or maiming of another person, heresy, apostasy, abuse of the sacraments of baptism or orders; and the same effect is produced by what is technically known as constructive bigamy, the marriage (if consummated) with any woman not a virgin, which, though not forbidden by ordinary law, is yet considered a sufficient declension from the ideal of marriage (cf. Lev. xxi. 13, 14) to disqualify a man for ordination. In case a man has been ordained in spite of his irregularity, his orders are valid, but he is not permitted to exercise them. Dispensation from irregularity can be granted as a rule by the pope alone—only in some exceptional cases by the bishop.

(P. Hinschius†.)

Bibliography: Bingham, *Origines*, IV., iii.–vii.; L. Thomassin, *Vetus et nova ecclesiae disciplina*, II., i. 62–63, 3 vols., Paris, 1728; F. E. a Boenninghausen, *Tractatus juridico-canonicus de irregularitatibus*, part iii., Münster, 1867; P. Hinschius, *Das Kirchenrecht . . . in Deutschland*, i. 7 sqq., Berlin, 1869; E. Friedberg, *Lehrbuch des . . . Kirchenrechts*, pp. 134 sqq., Leipsic, 1895.

Life in Scotland.

IRVING, EDWARD: Scotch Presbyterian, usually regarded as the founder of the Catholic Apostolic Church (q.v.), whose members are popularly known as Irvingites; b. at Annan (15 m. e.s.e. of Dumfries), Dumfriesshire, Aug. 4, 1792; d. in Glasgow Dec. 7, 1834. At thirteen he was sent to the University of Edinburgh, and at seventeen he became a teacher of mathematics in the school at Haddington. A year later he took charge of a new academy at Kirkcaldy, but still kept up his theological studies and a more or less regular attendance on the university lectures. It was at this period that he made the acquaintance of Thomas Carlyle (the author, to be distinguished from a later apostle of the same name), who has left the most vivid picture of his development. In 1815 he passed his theological examinations and received a license to preach from the presbytery of Kirkcaldy. After three years, not very successful as a preacher, and weary of teaching, he went back to Edinburgh and occupied himself with linguistic and scientific studies. He was seriously thinking of going as a missionary to Persia when, in Oct., 1819, the position was offered him of assistant to Dr. Chalmers at St. John's, Glasgow. Overshadowed by Chalmers, and unpopular with the majority of the congregation, he was glad to exchange this position in 1822 for that of minister of the small congregation in London connected with a Scotch asylum in Hatton Garden. He received ordination at the hands of the presbytery of Annan, and took his leave of Glasgow in a remarkable sermon which called for a complete revision of the methods of Christian preaching.

Success in London.

In London he at once made an impression, which was partly due to his striking appearance; he was over six feet tall, his pale face framed in dark locks which fell almost to his shoulders. No one could hear him without being conscious of a powerful and dominating personality. His flowery, rhetorical style soon attracted a large circle of hearers, for which the little church was too small. A new one was built in Regent Square, and for a time he was the fashionable preacher of London. He appealed especially to the educated classes; and it was to them that he spoke in his first published work, *For the Oracles of God, Four Orations. For Judgment to Come, an Argument in Nine Parts* (London, 1823). The attention attracted by his writings increased his popularity, and at the same time heightened his self-consciousness; he felt himself called to be the prophet of his people, and scornfully rejected the well-meant warnings of many members of the Evangelical party.

Joins Drummond's Circle.

The upheaval of the French Revolution had aroused in England a strong tendency to apocalyptic and millenarian thought, which found expression in numerous writings. Among those most strongly impressed by this thought was Henry Drummond (q.v.), a rich banker who had gathered around him a circle of like-minded friends, devoted to gaining general recognition for their apocalyptic views. Irving adopted the singular exegesis and the whole train of thought of Drummond's circle, which opened to him an entirely new field as a preacher of repentance. In a long discourse, later printed with enlargements (*Babylon and Infidelity Foredoomed of God*, Glasgow, 1826), preached at the anniversary of the Continental Society in 1825, he developed these thoughts and foretold the second coming of the Lord for the year 1864. Next he published, with an introduction of 200 pages, a recasting of a work published pseudonymously in 1816 by Lacunza, a Spanish ex-Jesuit, under the title *The Coming of Messiah in Glory and Majesty* (London, 1827). Meantime a regular "school of the prophets" had gathered around him, who, from the end of 1826, met annually at Drummond's country-seat of Albury, near Guildford. From 1829 to 1833 they published a periodical, *The Morning Watch, a Journal of Prophecy.*

Rise of Irvingites.

A sectarian tendency soon developed. Irving had been saying from 1824 on that since the fivefold office of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers had disappeared from the Church, the Holy Ghost had deserted it. Irving thus showed an increasing tendency to depart from the principles of Scotch Presbyterianism. He now denied predestination; following the High-church teaching of Hooker, he felt himself a priest and required his people so to regard him; and toward the end of 1827 he gave utterance to Christological views which were regarded as the grossest heresy, speaking of the "sinful substance" of the body of Christ. In defense of his view, he wrote a long rhetorical treatise on the Incarnation which forms the third and fourth parts of his *Sermons, Lectures, and Occasional Discourses* (3 vols., London, 1828). This attitude, combined with his apocalyptic vagaries, damaged his position in London. About this time a union of prayer was formed to beseech a new outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and Irving's assistant, Alexander Scott, expressed the hope that the special *charismata* of the primitive Church might once more be bestowed in answer to these supplications. Fresh excitement was aroused by two preaching-tours of Irving's through Scotland in 1828 and 1829, and in Mar., 1830, occurred the phenomena elsewhere detailed (see Catholic Apostolic Church), which were taken as a fulfilment of these hopes.

At least a commission from London, of which the lawyer Cardale was the most prominent member, accepted them as the expected renewal of the primitive gifts, and a confirmation of the whole trend of apocalyptic preaching. Similar phenomena now occurred at gatherings in Cardale's house; prophecy and speaking with tongues became more and more frequent. Irving attempted for a time to keep these manifestations separate from the church services proper, while he welcomed them and made use of the messages thus delivered, and looked to the revival of the offices already recognized as essential. But revelation succeeded revelation, and presently Irving could no longer hold back the growing enthusiasm. In Oct., 1831, it took possession of his church, amid scenes of great excitement. When Irving was summoned, in 1830, before the general presbytery of the Scotch churches in London to answer for his Christological views, and denied their jurisdiction, appealing to the general synod in Scotland, his own presbytery had stood by him. But now it accused him of violation of the liturgical ordinances in allowing women, and men who were not properly ordained ministers, to speak in his church. Sentence of deposition was pronounced on May 2, 1832. Four days later Irving began independent services in a hall with about 800 communicants, and in October he removed to a remodeled studio in Newman Street, leaving behind him the last remnants of the old Presbyterian order.

Irving Superseded.

Though Irving was the "angel" of the Church, the voices of the prophets left him little hearing. Cardale, Drummond, and the prophet Taplin took the lead of the movement, and the new organization proceeded rapidly. New functionaries were created as the Spirit bade, on the analogy of New-Testament indications, and presently there were six other congregations in London, forming, with Irving's, the counterpart of the seven churches of the Apocalypse. Irving accepted the whole development in faith, although he had conceived the apostolic office as something different, which should not interfere with the independence of himself as the "angel." But he had lost control of the movement, and those who now led it lost no opportunity of humiliating the man to whose personality they had owed so much. When the sentence of deposition was confirmed by the presbytery of Annan, and then by the Scottish general synod, and he returned to London strong in the consciousness of his call by God to the office of angel and pastor of the church, he was not allowed to baptize a child, but was told to wait until, on the bidding of the prophets, he should be again ordained by an apostle. His health was now failing, and his physician ordered him, in the autumn of 1834, to winter in the south. He went, however, to Scotland, where the prophets had promised him great success in the power of the Spirit, and died in Glasgow, where he is buried in the crypt of the cathedral.

(T. Kolde.)

Bibliography: Irving's *Collected Writings* were edited by his nephew, G. Carlyle, 5 vols., London, 1864–65. Besides the literature under Catholic Apostolic Church, especially the biography by Mrs. Oliphant, and Carlyle's *Reminiscences*, consult D. Brown, *Personal Reminiscences of Edward Irving*, in *Expositor*, 1887; C. K. Paul, in *Biographical Sketches*, London, 1883; W. A. Smith, "*Shepherd*" *Smith, the Universalist*, London, 1892.

IRVINGITES. See Catholic Apostolic Church; and Irving, Edward.

ISAAC (Hebr. *yiẓḥaḳ*, more rarely *yisḥaḳ*, "the laugher"; LXX. *Isaak*, Vulg. *Isaac*): the son of Abraham and Sarah, who served as an object for testing his father's faith and obedience. He was born (according to P) in Abraham's hundredth year and in Sarah's ninetieth. Gen. xxi. 6 (E?)—cf. xvii. 17 (P), xviii. 12 sqq. (J)—brings the name into connection with his birth. Abraham's obedience was shown in the circumcision of the boy eight days after his birth (Gen. xxi. 4, P), and in his readiness to sacrifice, at God's command, this son for whom he had so ardently longed (chap. xxii.). Isaac in this submitted to the will of his father, just as he did later in his marriage with Rebekah, although he was then forty years old. Few details are given in regard to the remainder of Isaac's life, and he appears as a rather weak copy of his father. He manifested a lesser fondness for journeying, since his travels were confined to the southern portion of the land, the Negeb, and the neighboring territory. In this desolate region, the well Lahai-roi (Gen. xxiv. 62; the modern Munailah), Gerar, the Philistine city (xxvi. 1; the modern Jerar), the valley of Gerar (xxvi. 17), Beersheba (xxvi. 23), and finally Hebron (xxxv. 27), are places where he sojourned for a time. When at Gerar, according to Gen. xxvi. 7 sqq., he had an experience with King Abimelech similar to his father's (Gen. xx. 1 sqq., E, xii. 10 sqq., J). The similarity of the three accounts does not necessarily imply that they are variations of the same incident; but borrowings and substitutions may have taken place in oral tradition.

Isaac was characterized, as contrasted with Abraham, by a certain advance in civilization. In Gerar he devoted himself both to the raising of flocks and herds and to agriculture. His food was game and his drink was wine, while Abraham obtained the latter only from some other prince. Isaac appeared always as pacifically inclined, yielding to his envious neighbors when they disputed with him the possession of wells, and yet he enjoyed a singular respect on the part of strangers, who considered it desirable to be on friendly footing with the "blessed of the Lord" (Gen. xxvi. 28 sqq.). The principal significance of Isaac is that he carried over the divine blessing of the covenant from Abraham to Jacob, the ancestor of Israel. After his wife had been for a long time barren (Gen. xxv. 21), twin children of very different characters, Esau and Jacob, were granted to him in answer to his prayer. Although the father clung to the elder, when old and blind he was forced by the stratagem of his wife to bestow upon his younger son, Jacob, the blessing which had been bequeathed to him by Abraham (Gen. xxvi. 3 sqq., 24). Isaac showed little independence either at home or abroad, in place of which his submission to the decrees of the Almighty gave him his position between Abraham the faithful and Jacob, the champion of the faith. In this trio Isaac represents that pious fidelity which guards the inherited blessing, more occupied with its preservation than with any idea of further gain. For later Jews he appears as "the chief of the bound and tortured" (Midrash to Esther), that is, the prototype of martyrs.

The story of Isaac is made up from the three Pentateuchal sources, which agree essentially in their narratives and guarantee the historical character of Isaac's personality. His name does not yield to the explanation that it belonged to a divinity or a tribe, the significance "he laughs" being inappropriate to both.

The designation of God as "the fear of Isaac" (Gen. xxxi. 42, 53) is peculiar. Since this "fear" was sworn by, it must mean "divinity," corresponding to the Greek *sebas* in the sense of *sebasma*, "an object of awe or reverence."

(C. von Orelli.)

Bibliography: A. Bernstein, *Ursprung der Sagen von Abraham, Isaak und Jakob*, Berlin, 1871; J. Popper, *Ursprung des Monotheismus*, pp. 261 sqq., ib. 1879; J. B. Mozley, *Ruling Ideas in Early Ages*, chaps. ii.–iii., New York, 1879; E. C. A. Riehm, *Handwörterbuch des biblischen Altertums*, pp. 791–792, Leipsic, 1893; G. B. Gray, *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, p. 214, London, 1896; G. Maspero, *Struggle of the Nations*, p. 68, ib. 1896; *DB*, ii. 483–485; *EB*, ii. 2174–2179 (stimulating); *JE*, vi. 616–618. Consult also the appropriate sections in works on the history of Israel and the commentaries on Genesis.

ISAAC OF ANTIOCH: The name of a writer (perhaps of several writers) of the early Syrian Church. Jacob of Edessa (cf. W. Wright, *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, ii. 603–604, London, 1871) distinguishes three of the name, two whom he calls orthodox and a third whom he styles a Chalcedonian heretic. The first was a disciple of Ephraem, and went to Rome in the time of Arcadius; on his return he was kept for some time in prison in Constantinople, and later became presbyter of Amida. The second, presbyter of Edessa, went to Antioch in the time of the Emperor Zeno and the patriarch Peter the Fuller (see Monophysites, §§ 4 sqq.), and preached against the Nestorians, taking his text from a parrot which he had heard screech the trisagion with the addition "crucified for us." The third, also from Edessa, was orthodox in the time of Bishop Paul (512 sqq.), but Nestorian under Asclepius (522 sqq.). Gennadius knows of two writers of the name. The second (*De vir. ill.*, lxvi.), presbyter of Antioch, lived to an advanced age and wrote much, including an elegy on the fall of Antioch (459); he died under Leo and Majorian (between 459 and 461). Zacharias Rhetor (ed. K. Ahrens and G. Krüger, Leipsic, 1889, p. *20) mentions "Isaac, the teacher of Syria," with Dada in the time of Arcadius and Theodosius. Dionysius of Telmahre knows of poems by Isaac on the capture of Rome by the Goths (410) and the secular games of 404. Johannes bar Shushan (d. 1073), who collected the writings of Isaac, calls him a disciple of Ephraem's disciple, Zenobius. There is an edition of his works (incomplete) by G. Bickell (2 vols., Giessen, 1873–77); thirty-seven productions out of about two hundred are given, including a poem of not less than 2,136 lines on the parrot and the trisagion, and another of 1,928 lines on repentance. A volume of Isaac's homilies has been published by P. Bedjan (Paris, 1903).

E. Nestle.

Bibliography: J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, i. 207–304, Rome, 1719; P. Zingerle, in *TQ*, lii (1870), 92–114; G. Cardahi, *Liber thesauri de arte poetica Syrorum*, pp. 21–25, Rome, 1875; W. Wright, *Short Hist. of Syriac Literature*, pp. 51–54, London, 1894; R. Duval, *Littérature syriaque*, pp. 340–341, Paris, 1900; *DCB*, iii. 295–296.

ISAAC OF NINEVEH: Bishop of Nineveh in the seventh century. He was made bishop by the patriarch George (660–680), in succession to Moses, but retired after five months, and died, almost blind from much study, in the monastery of Rabban Shabor. One of his works exists in Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic, and also in a Greek translation by two monks, Patricius and Abraham, of the monastery of Mar Saba, southeast of Jerusalem, and published by Nicephorus (Leipsic, 1770; in *MPG*, lxxxvi. 799–888). A Latin translation under the title *Isaac Syrus, liber de contemptu mundi* in fifty-three chapters is in the *Bibliotheca magna* (Cologne, 1618, VI., ii. 688; Gallandi, *Bibliotheca*, xii. 3). Another work entitled "Letter to the Holy Father Simon in the Wonderful Mountain" is published in Greek in Mai's *Nova Bibliotheca*, vol. viii., part 3 (Rome, 1871), pp. 156–188; it is interesting for its information about Malpat of Edessa, the originator of the Messalians, and the knowledge it shows of apocalyptic literature. E. Nestle.

Bibliography: The earlier literature, viz., J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, i. 44, Rome, 1719; W. Wright, *Short Hist. of Syriac Literature*, London, 1894; and J. B. Chabot, *De S. Isaaci Ninivitae vita, scriptis et doctrina*, Paris, 1892, is to be corrected by *Jésusdenah, évêque de Baçrah, le livre de la chasteté*, ed. J. B. Chabot, Rome 1896, cf. J. B. Chabot in *Revue sémitique*, 1896, p. 254. Consult also: *DCB*, iii. 291–292; W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac MSS.*, ii. 569–581, London, 1870–72.

ISAAC BEN SHESHET BARFAT: Spanish Jewish talmudist; b. at Valencia in 1326; d. at Algiers in 1408. He studied at Barcelona, where he also began his life-work, early gaining a reputation as a talmudist and being called upon for legal opinions. When fifty he became rabbi, removed later to Saragossa, and thence to Valencia. In 1391, in consequence of persecution of the Jews, he fled, going to Algiers, where he was made rabbi. He was the author of 417 "responsa" which have been highly valued by competent authorities, published as *She 'elot u-Teshubot* (Constantinople, 1546–47); and possibly of an unpublished commentary on the Pentateuch.

Bibliography: *JE*, vi. 631–632.

ISAACS, ABRAM SAMUEL: Jewish rabbi; b. in New York City Aug. 30, 1852. He was educated at New York University (B.A., 1871) and the University of Breslau (1878), and since 1886 has been connected with New York University, where he has been professor of Hebrew (1886–94) and German (since 1887). He was also preacher to the East 86th Street Synagogue, New York City, in 1886–87, and since 1896 has been rabbi of B'nai Jeshurun Congregation, Paterson, N. J. He was editor of *The Jewish Messenger* from 1878 to 1903, and has written, *Life and Writings of Moses Chaim Luzzatto* (New York, 1878) and *Stories from the Rabbis* (New York, 1894).

ISAIAH.

I. The Prophet and his Times.
  Reports concerning Isaiah (§ 1).
  Chronology of the Period (§ 2).
  External Events (§ 3).
  Relation of Events to Faith (§ 4).
  Ideals Underlying Prophecies (§5).
  Isaiah's Life and Character (§ 6).
II. The Book of Isaiah.
  1. Its Place in the Canon.
  2. The Text.
    Its Condition (§ 1).
    Causes and Kinds of Errors (§ 2).
  3. Authorship.
    Prophetic Authorship in General (§ 1).
    Interrelations of i.–xxxv. and xl.–lxvi (§ 2).
    Authorship substantially Isaianic (§ 3).
    Isaianic Authorship of xxviii.–xxxv (§ 4).
    Chapters ii.–xii (§ 5).
    Chapters xiii.–xxvii (§ 6).
    Results of the Investigation (§ 7).
III. The Critical View.
  The Problem (§ 1).
  Structure of the Book (§2).
  Results of Criticism (§ 3).
  Analysis of Isa. i.–xxxix (§ 4).
  Analysis of Isa. xl.–lxvi (§ 5).
  Conclusion (§ 6).

I. The Prophet and His Times: The name rendered "Isaiah" in English has in the Hebrew two forms, *Yesha‘yah*, and *Yesha‘yahu*, the latter in his book, II Kings xviii.–xxi., and I Chron. xxv. 3, 15, xxvi. 25, II Chron. xxvi. 22, xxxii. 32, the former in I Chron. iii. 21; Neh. xi. 7. In the Septuagint it varies greatly, taking the forms *Iesias, Iessias, Iōseas, Hēsaias, Isaias, Osaias.* The derivations and meanings given are quite varied.

1. Reports Concerning Isaiah.

Outside the book called by his name and II Kings xviii.–xxi., Isaiah the prophet is mentioned only twice in the Bible. II Chron. xxvi. 22 states that the acts of Uzziah of Judah were written down by Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz. The method of citation here deviates from the usual formula, so that either incompleteness or defacement of the text is suspected, while the Septuagint lacks the phrase "son of Amoz" and has further variations. The passage adds nothing to knowledge of the prophet gained elsewhere. It has been taken, in connection with Isa. i. 1, as ground for the conjecture that the prophet lived through the entire reigns of the four kings mentioned, and that Isa. vi. tells of a renewed call of the prophet after a period of quietness. This is favored by the position of chap. vi., and modern students are inclined to attribute chaps. i.–v. wholly or in part to the early years of Uzziah. II Chron. xxxii. 32 speaks of a record in the "Vision of Isaiah" of the deeds of Hezekiah which is in the Book of Kings. The Septuagint, Vulgate, and Targum place an "and" before "in the book," thus mentioning two sources. It is to be noticed that "Vision of Isaiah" was the title of the canonical Book of Isaiah (Isa. i. 1). The passage was early taken as indicating an independent "Vision of Isaiah," and an apocryphal book of that character was cited by Origen, and is perhaps the "Martyrdom (or Ascension) of Isaiah" known in the Ethiopic (see Pseudepigrapha, Old Testament, II. 34), dealing with the martyrdom of Isaiah under Manasseh. This tradition of a martyrdom appears also in the Gemara (*Yebamot* 49b) as drawn from "an early genealogical record" and due to a condemnation of certain utterances of the prophet. Another tradition connects the death of Isaiah with his condemnation of the act of Manasseh recorded in II Kings xxi. 7, and brings into relation with this event the passage Isa. lxvi. 1 sqq., and a prediction of the coming of Nebuchadrezzar to destroy the temple. This aroused the wrath of Manasseh, who ordered the prophet to be brought and slain. Isaiah fled and took refuge in the heart of a tree, which closed about him and hid him. But his pursuers sawed through the tree until the blood of the prophet flowed forth as water. The passages II Kings xxi. 16, xxiv. 3–4 are brought into relation with this tradition and the event is said to have occurred on Tammuz 17, corresponding to July 6, given in the Roman Catholic calendar (cf. *ASB*, July, ii. 250 sqq.; A. Klostermann, *Das Datum des Martyrium Jesaias im römischen Kalendar,* in *TSK*, 1880, pp. 536 sqq.). The one tradition of value seems to be that which places his death in the reign of Manasseh.

2. Chronology of the Period.

This tradition may be brought into connection with the title of the book by way of defining the period of activity of the prophet. To the period of the four kings mentioned in the title may be added an undefined but short period under Manasseh, and Isa. vi. 1 is often taken as indicating the entry of Isaiah upon prophetic work in the last year of Uzziah. Supposing that he was then twenty years old, his age at the accession of Manasseh would be eighty-one; thus: the destruction of Jerusalem was in 586 B.C., the eleventh year of Zedekiah; then, according to the reckoning of the Book of Kings, Manasseh began to reign in 696 B.C., Hezekiah in 725 B.C., Ahaz in 741 B.C., Jotham in 757 B.C., and the death of Uzziah would fall in 758 B.C. [or 757]; the siege of Samaria under Shalmaneser began in the fourth year of Hezekiah, 722 B.C., and its capture by Sargon in Hezekiah's sixth year, 720 B.C. If it is assumed, as is most probable, that the sign on the dial of Ahaz is to be connected with the eclipse of Mar. 14, 711 B.C. (F. K. Ginzel, *Spezieller Kanon der Sonnen- und Mondfinsternisse,* Berlin, 1899), visible in Jerusalem, then the foregoing statements in general and the assignment of the year 711 B.C. for the healing of Hezekiah tally with astronomical data. Therefore the embassy from Merodach-baladan (Isa. xxxix. 1) would fall at the earliest in 711 B.C., and Hezekiah's determination to throw off Assyrian overlordship would fall in 710 B.C. The Ptolemaic Canon allows to a Mardokempados twelve years as king of Babylon, and to his conqueror, Sargon, five years; then the last year of Mardokempados is the thirty-eighth of the era of Nabonassar, and the first year of Sargon is 709 B.C. Then that the "king of Babylon," Merodach-baladan (Isa. xxxix. 1), is not an indefinite usurper of that name, but that the Mardokempados of the Ptolemaic Canon is the Merodach-baladan of the Assyrian inscriptions does not imply error either in that he is called "son of Yakin" in the

Canon or that he is called " son of Baladan " in Isa. xxxix. The former is accounted for by his capital being at Bit Yakin or Dur Yakin, evidently taken as named for an eponymous ancestor, and the latter may have arisen from a like connection with a supposed ancestor mentioned in the second element of his own name. Thus the Assyrian data harmonize with the foregoing calculations. According to contract tablets adduced by G. Smith (*Assyrian Eponym Canon*, London, 1875, pp. 86–87), Sargon's fourteenth year fell in the eponymate of Samashupahir, and his fifteenth year as king of Assyria is stated to have been his third as king of Babylon; his thirteenth year over Assyria was therefore his first over Babylon, i.e., 709 B.C., and his reign over Assyria began 722–721 B.C.; Sargon's seventeenth and last regnal year was 705 B.C., and the first of his successor, Sennacherib, was 704 B.C. The Eponym Canon and the Ptolemaic Canon give assistance from this point on. From Assyrian records it is clear that the regnal year of Sargon began in the middle of an eponymate. The discrepancy between the Biblical date of 720 B.C. and the apparent Assyrian of 722 B.C. is explained partly by confusion between the beginning of the eponymous year and the regnal year of the king, and partly by a transposition occurring in the Canon lists. Concerning the relation of Shalmaneser to his predecessor, Tiglath-Pileser, nothing can be said, as the Canons fail here. But if the first regnal year of Sennacherib fell in the last part of the eponymate of Nabudinipus and the first part of the latter's successor's, Sennacherib can not have made an expedition to the West in Hezekiah's fourteenth year (Isa. xxxvi. 1), which expedition he states that he made in his own third year, when he shut Hezekiah up " like a bird in a cage " (Schrader, *KAT*, p. 293). If it be assumed that Sennacherib's full regnal year is meant, it might fall in 702–701 B.C., and with this would agree the supposition that the surely erroneous dating in Hezekiah's fourteenth year of Isa. xxxvi. 1 is due to a previous mention of his twenty-fourth year. So that in 702 B.C., according to the Assyrian basis, began the Assyrian subjection of Judah and Hezekiah.

3. External Events.

Then Isaiah's activity as a prophet would fall between 758 and 690 B.C. at the latest, a period of singular moment. The Assyrians, in their conquest of Syria and Palestine, laid a basis for further conquests in the northwest and southwest, hindered, however, by the danger from the Medes and other peoples in their rear. By the movements which went on about them, the Jews were brought into contact with world politics, and in the Book of Isaiah the fortunes of distant and neighboring peoples receive larger notice than had been customary. The northern kingdom fell from the high estate it achieved under Jeroboam II. after a career in which the most contradictory state policies had been pursued. It had become identified with an attempt to unite Syria, Israel, and Judah against Assyria, in which the refusal of Judah had led to an attempt to set aside the Davidic dynasty in Judah. Uzziah had thought to strengthen his own kingdom by securing his boundaries with fortresses and by heaping up the means and materials of war to furnish material guaranties for the faith of the Jews in the security of the city of Yahweh and of the dynasty. Ahaz preferred to depend upon the clemency of the Assyrian king. Hezekiah rejected this means of quiet, and put his trust in Yahweh without using human means.

4. Relation of Events to Faith.

The lessons of the period for the pious of Israel and of all times are that Yahweh reaches the ends corresponding to his being through the history of his people and of the world. It does not follow that he repudiates his people or his promises to their fathers, nor yet that he makes the foundation of his kingdom dependent upon the hegemony of any earthly state where his worship should be conducted. While he permitted the Davidic kingdom to fall apart and Jerusalem to become the capital of the smaller division, allowed Israel's land to receive a new population, and the Davidic king to become a vassal of Assyria, while he brought to nought Sennacherib's plans against Jerusalem, the purpose seemed to be to purify the faith of the people that his might and will should ordain healing or destruction. The Israelites had supposed God's interests bound up with those of his people in his land and its institutions. But they had to learn through discipline that the people to whom his promises came and to whom they applied was a people which corresponded in its essence to his own sanctity and were not dependent upon mere fleshly hopes. It contravened past experience that he who had promised to be the savior of his people should permit them to be beaten and subdued, while to tyrants whose purpose he hated he had given the victory. The kingdom of Jeroboam, founded on cunning and force, was no better than other kingdoms; nor was the kingdom of Judah, with its externals of sacrifice, that to which he had made his promises. Of course, the conquerors, who thanked themselves and their gods for the victory, were even less fitted to be his servants. The destruction of the foe at the pinnacle of his greatness and the restoration of his people were to reveal the fulfilment of his promises, no more to be endangered by the rule of sin.

5. Ideals Underlying Prophecies.

Yet Yahweh had not given over his land, destroyed his people, laid in ruins the house of David and Jerusalem, burned up the world and destroyed mankind in order to create a new earth. Rather the idea was that symbolized by the plant world, where the dying vegetation promises new life by its seeds and its shoots. So in the dying Israel there was an imperishable remainder, which was to survive destruction and to live again in unassailable dominion, to be menaced neither by sin nor the anger of God. The people which had been destroyed was to be awakened to new life, and the house of David was to rise to renewed kingly power in the son of a young woman. But this was to take form neither in nation, state, nor race. The germ can be considered only as an invisible church known only to Yahweh. And since in Israel the prophet of Yahweh is he who learns the will of Yahweh in the conditions of things and translates the dark sayings of God as uttered in the events of history, so the people gathered by the prophet's word and unified by it is the indestructible Zion, the enduring remainder of Israel which makes the prophet's teachings the ground of its inner life. The prophet is the medium of this new life. His conduct in life, his hope in sorrow, are the prefigurement and pledge of that which is destined for the community.

6. Isaiah's Life and Character.

Such a person does Isaiah appear in the testimony, direct and indirect, which his book carries. Outside of the reports of his life already considered, it may be gathered that he was a citizen of Jerusalem; that he had several children, one of whom, a son, must have been born in Jotham's reign (vii. 3), and another during the Syrian-Ephraimitic war (viii. 1 sqq.); that he regarded wife, children, and the events of family life as living pictures and true signs of the prophecies he uttered; that he looked back upon the hour of consecration pictured in chap. vi. as pivotal, and as conditioning his inner life (viii. 11 sqq.). Since his care and hopes were so different from those which public life offered, he deemed it his duty to implant in continuing security in the heart of a receptive circle, for use in the future, the divine knowledge which had come to him.

In chap. vii., in the midst of the Syrian-Ephraimitic crisis, Isaiah sought in vain to direct the policy of the Davidic house away from dependence upon Assyria to trust in Yahweh, and in chap. viii. testified that the waters of Shiloah were sufficient to withstand the turbulence of Rezin and Pekah, and they did not need the addition of the flood of Assyrian might, which would overflow the land it was designed to protect. Later Isaiah again sought to stem the course of public events among his people by glowing predictions of positive success. Such a case is presented in the reign of Hezekiah when the foe was drawn away from Jerusalem and the danger to the city was averted by the catastrophe which befell the enemy.

II. The Book of Isaiah.—1. Its Place in the Canon: In the Hebrew Bible Isaiah stands first in the division of the so-called later prophets and precedes Jeremiah and Ezekiel evidently upon the ground of priority in history, but in the Septuagint it is preceded by the book of the Minor Prophets (cf. Jerome, *Ad Paulinum, Prologus galeatus*). The Hebrew order is confirmed by the treatment in Ecclus. xlviii. 22–xlix. 10. The Talmudic tract *Baba bathra* (col. xiv., col. 2) makes Jeremiah follow Kings and puts Isaiah between Ezekiel and the Twelve according to the principle which arranges books approximately in order of length. Reasons for this difference in order are variously given: Vitringa thought that the placing of Jeremiah first was due to the tradition that Jeremiah had composed the Books of Kings; Lightfoot alleged apologetic interests which used the order in which Jeremiah stood first to show that Matt. xxvii. 9 was not in error, since the whole of the prophetic canon might then be called after the name of the first book; still others thought it might be due to the fact that after Jeremiah and Ezekiel had taken form, Isaiah had been changed or that it had taken form only in the time of Cyrus. But these methods of reasoning are not conclusive.

1. Its Condition.

2. The Text: The variety of contents and style, the idealistic character of the oracles and the originality of thought have from earliest times made this book difficult to understand. Much read and often edited, it could not maintain its original form, and it became the object of an exegesis which sought to come to an understanding with the traditional text as an inviolable and sacred thing. The condition of the text in chaps. xl.–lxvi. may be seen in Klostermann's commentary (Munich, 1893) of chaps. xxxvi.–xxxix. in the same author's commentary on the parallel section in Kings (Munich, 1887) and in *TSK*, 1884. And revision of the whole text of chaps. i.–xxxv. is required before exegesis can be securely founded, an especially difficult task, for which the test of meter and artistic form, so often suggested, is of very little value. Indeed, changes of form by the prophet or his disciples are not excluded from consideration; for example, in the great picture of the judgment under the figure of an earthquake in xxiv., at verse 7 there is the beginning of an alphabetical elegy in six-lined strophes, the first two strophes of which are present and complete, while of the third only the first half is given. Similarly in xxiii. 16 only the beginning of a known song is cited, and this may explain the break at the end of xxiv. 12.

2. Causes and Kinds of Errors.

Not to be disregarded are the paraphrases of Jonathan, the fragments of Aquilas, Theodotion, and Symmachus as they have come down with the marginal notes of the Hexapla and from the notes of Jerome. These will at times serve to indicate the introduction of errors in later times. Thus, Jonathan indicates in viii. 14 the loss of "for you" after "he shall be," a conclusion supported not only by the Vulgate, but by the second person in the Septuagint. Doubled readings or translations in these texts are often a guide to the original text, since they point to a misreading or a misunderstanding of a reading to which such misunderstanding is a direct guide, as in xxxiii. 7, where "their valiant ones" was read by the translators in a double sense as the object of fear and as the subject, which led to further changes in the text of the verse. The Septuagint shows a similar doubled reading in ii. 16b through a mistake of the eye involving further changes in the text. Sometimes a doubled reading is merely a mistake in copying produced by itacism, as in viii. 23, codex 304. But a critical text of the Septuagint will show that sometimes the translator in deciphering his Hebrew exemplar has in a surprising manner gone wrong through too great confidence in his apprehension of the context. Such a case is presented in viii. 7–8. Examinations of the Septuagint make it perfectly clear that its present text is the result of a long period of correction of a text which sought to give the sense of the prophetical deliverances without having a sure insight into the meaning and the form of the original. But the early text together with the corrections themselves and the differences between them often put the student upon the track of a better Hebrew text than the one which has been transmitted. There is in mind here not only the כְּדָוִד of xxix. 3 in the Septuagint, which alone explains why Yahweh, who is beleaguering Ariel in verse 1, has made mention of the siege of Ariel by David in early times, but also the *tōi agapētōi sou* of xxvi. 17. In this latter case the לִידִדְךָ, which apparently lay before the translator, goes back to an original לְנֶגְדְּךָ, which belonged to verse 18 and marks מפניך as superfluous, suggested indeed by the doubled קדם of Jonathan.

Such cases as this, which are frequent, are sufficient to enable the student to correct the errors and sometimes the gaps which occur in the synagogue text of the Hebrew. Again, the original of x. 11 was doubtless originally "shall I not also do so to Samaria and her idols and to Jerusalem and her images." The present text sets the lot of Samaria as a type and prophecy of the lot of Jerusalem, and pictures the fall of Samaria as a past event, which is the result of a redaction which changed the text of the prophet to square with a later historical situation. Mistakes of pointing are also to be noted, as when וּשְׁמָמָה in i. 7 is thus pointed as a noun instead of וְשָׁמֵמָה as a verb, or in x. 13 the waw in וְאָסִיר and וְאוֹרִיד is given the simple shewa instead of kamets. Still worse is the pointing דָּבָר for דֶּבֶר in ix. 8, for which the Septuagint has *thanatos*, "death," which corresponds closely to the "pestilence" for which the proposed reading stands. Accentuation and vocalization are both astray in ix. 1, "in the former time," where for כָּעֵת should be read כְּעַתָּ(ה) and the words should be joined with the clause which goes before. Part of the errors of text are due to the difficulties which underlay the consonantal form. This especially occurs in transferring an initial ה to the end of the preceding word, but appears also in the loss of the letter in the middle or end of a word, as when אראלם for אראה להם was given the form אֶרְאֶלָּם. A similar case occurs in viii. 6, where the double reading (מ)שׂואת שאת came to be written (מ)שׂושאת, and then was changed into משׂושׂ את. Other changes are caused by the inclusion in the text of notes originally made in the margin, for a case of which cf. vii. 8–9 with verse 4. With such enlargements of the text correspond also gaps, which are the result of carelessness or chance, or which rest upon intended shortening of the reading or upon customary abbreviations. A case of the last is found in viii. 21, where "curse by their king and their God" should read "curse the house of their king and their God," where the letter beth, represented in the English by "by," is an abbreviation or a mistake for *beth*, "house." Between "for" and "head" in viii. 8 has fallen out the word אֶשָּׂא, "I will take away." If, as in the last case cited, a word may fall out, so frequently from a word a letter may be missing, of which numerous examples might be cited. To these causes of change may be added exchanges of letters which either look or sound alike. Thus, in xi. 4, עָרִיץ demanded by the parallelism appears as ארץ, and in i. 7, xxv. 2, and xxix. 5, instead of זֵדִים there appears זרים. Intentional amendment appears in the change from the third person to the first in v. 3–6, influenced by verse 2. Indeed, the riddles of interpretation in whole sections of Isaiah, such as the six deliverances of chaps. xxviii.–xxxv., the section xxiv.–xxvii., and their relation to other parts of the book require as a preliminary to their solution the amendment of the text, which is a preliminary to the work of the higher criticism and the determination of the time to which these sections belong.

1. Prophetic Authorship in General.

3. Authorship: It is evident that a prophet who intervened in public affairs in crises so important, whose experiences were so large, who, even in the quiet of private life, was unwearyingly diligent in instructing a band of disciples with a broad future in view, employed writing not only for the purpose of extending his personal activity beyond his immediate environment, as, for example, to the Israelites in exile, to the end that they might have his words of comfort in their original form, but that he had an outlook upon the more distant future. This must have been especially the case when the subject matter was issued at the joining-point of the past and the future when old things were becoming new, when the utterances were needed as a means of recognizing God's work at the time and for the time. It must have been in such a spirit that the prophets wrote their books and unified their earlier utterances in written discourse. They were enabled in this way to supplement by adding historical notices and even to refer to the words of earlier prophets. Since, in the book ascribed to Isaiah, there exist in the first person recollections of the fifty-second year of Uzziah, and in close connection with these and in similar style discourses which relate to affairs at least sixteen years later in the time of Ahaz, and inasmuch as these latter approve themselves as Isaianic by their congruity with the activities and character of Isaiah as shown in chaps. xxxvi.–xxxvii., and further, since in this book there appear whole series of addresses parallel in matter with the occasions of the time, and setting forth the same main idea, it is a fair presumption that Isaiah undertook a collection of his prophecies. The question is whether the present book contains only his sayings, or contains them in full, or in their original order. Until this is settled, it is of little use to quote what Sirach, Ambrosius, Jerome, Cyril, and others down to the present have said as to the worth of Isaiah from a Christian, ethical, or esthetic standpoint.

2. Interrelations of i.-xxxv. and xl.-lxvi.

To judge of all this a thoroughly new working-over is required, a historical investigation, and for this there is no better and no other starting-point than the section in chaps. xxxvi.–xxxix., a trustworthy narrative which has found place also in the Books of Kings (xviii. 13 sqq.). This narrative is interjected by the compiler of the book between two well-arranged collections of anonymous addresses, the first of which have relation to the Assyrian period and correspond to the contents of chaps. xxxvi.–xxxvii., while the second series has relation to the Babylonian side and corresponds to chap. xxxix. The second of the two series of addresses begins with a command to give comfort as the first closed with encouragement (xxxv. 3 sqq.); the second comes to a close in an opposition of Edom and Zion (lx. 1–lxiii. 6) just as does the first (xxxiii. 13–xxxv. 10). Since in both the general view of the Holy Land and Jerusalem is that of a desolate and depopulated region, to be repeopled by the return of the exiled, doubtless the editor meant to convey the idea that, of both parts, the Isaiah of xxxvi.–xxxix. is the prophetic author. It is therefore unscientific arbitrariness, instead of setting apart chaps. xxviii.–lxvi. and employing chaps. xxviii.–xxxix. as the key to xl.–lxvi., to break off after xxxv.–xxxix. and to imagine oneself in a new region. He who reads xxxv. 3–4 does not stumble at xl. 1; and only he who reads xxviii.–xxxix. can understand xlviii. 3–11, and can regard the same prophet as basing a second prediction upon the fulfilment of the first. He can apply xlii. 19 to the downfall of the northern kingdom, and xliii. 8–10 to the deliverance from Sennacherib, and lvi. 9–lvii. 21 to the end of the Isaianic times. Whoever dares to read the six addresses of a nameless prophet in xxviii.–xxxv. beginning with "Woe" and to regard them as Isaianic as a whole and to follow this out in such alleged exilic pieces as xxxiv.–xxxv. has no philosophical reason for the timidity with which he refuses to recognize xl.–lxvi. as also Isaianic. A hindrance to this has been the obviousness with which Cyrus is mentioned even by name, and the assurance with which the downfall of Babylon and the freeing of the Israelites is announced, predictions which the modern construction of all elements of the prophetic consciousness on the basis of our knowledge of his times seem to make impossible. But the Servant of Yahweh who is named Righteous is as concretely and definitely indicated as Cyrus and his relations to Babylon and Israel; and the hegemony of the restored Jerusalem and the repopulating of the Holy Land is more definitely portrayed than the downfall of Babylon. And, although the one fits better with Jesus of Nazareth, and the other with the Jerusalem of Herod's time, at least in externals, than with any other prophet or with the Jerusalem of any other time, yet the refusal is made so to relate the connections. If the enthusiastic utterances of a prophet work out into realization 500 years later, why could they not with reference to Cyrus? In fact, the book does not predict a coming victor to bear the name of Cyrus, but says of one who has come that he is the realization of predictions made long before for Jerusalem; the victory and success of Cyrus had been so directly indicated that it was evident that he could use his victory only as Yahweh willed, and the honor was to come not to him, but to Yahweh and his people. Thus Yahweh had laid violent hands upon the prophet when he seized upon the Isaianic period in which to bring before the prophet's vision this picture of the future. Isaiah realized that the present conqueror had been predicted long before as called from the East to carry out Yahweh's purposes of punishment, but that he had been driven back when in wilfulness he had attempted to go farther than Yahweh's purposes had carried. Why, then, should he not foresee a second conqueror, coming from the East and more completely realizing God's designs, who, by the very misfortunes which he brought, should create the desire in the heathen world for Yahweh, the only healing God, who is to be found in the midst of his people (xlv. 14–25)? And why should he not foresee the prophet who should so complete the work of renovation as to bring about the regeneration of the community? And to what prophet could such a vision so appropriately have come as to Isaiah, a man who, in the midst of the most untoward circumstances, could see around him the promise of a brilliant and righteous future?

3. Authorship Substantially Isaianic.

If this be true, a new exposition of chaps. xl.–lxvi. is required (the view-point of which was indicated in the *Lutherische Zeitschrift*, 1876) and a new investigation of the framework. But it will not do to resolve the section into a threefold arrangement, each part having nine chapters. As the first part is introduced by xl. 1–11, the second part is prefaced by xlviii. 16–22. The more naturally the investigation proceeds, the surer does it become that xl.–lxvi. does not as such proceed from Isaiah, but that it arranges and works over older prophecies. The tendency of modern criticism is to distinguish the "Servant of Yahweh section" and a "Trito-Isaiah," and, indeed, as many Isaiahs as differences in style suggest; yet by retaining for them the name Isaiah this criticism follows a correct instinct. The editor urges chaps. xxxvi.–xxxix. upon the reader as the key to the meaning of both xl.–lxvi. and xxviii.–xxxv., and as the vindication of these parts as Isaianic in substance.

4. Isaianic Authorship of xxviii.–xxxv.

It appears from the book of Isaiah that at least from the thirteenth year of Hezekiah till after the campaign of Sennacherib the prophet wielded a weighty and acknowledged authority with king, court, and priests, that he made predictions which were observably realized, that he assured the continuance of Jerusalem and Judah beyond the period of Assyrian stress and storm, while Assyria was to become a possession of Babylon; but besides this, it is clear that Hezekiah's resolution to withstand the Assyrian demands rested upon Isaiah's warnings and promises, and that the prophet was the responsible guarantor of a seemingly impossible fortunate issue. Indeed, xxxvii. 26 indicates a prediction by Isaiah of the Assyrian victories before Sennacherib's appearance. Upon the verification of this word of Yahweh as the Lord of the world was built the assurance that in the very moment when Assyrian victories were made the basis of belief that Yahweh was overcome the impotence of the Assyrian against him would be made manifest, and this dispensation would reveal decisively Yahweh's relation to Jerusalem and to the Davidic house. In view of this, the six woes which appear indissolubly woven together in chaps. xxviii.–xxxv. impress one as rendering exactly the historical position of the Isaiah of chaps. xxxvi.–xxxix. and as belonging to the texture of thought which is there demonstrably that of Isaiah. It may be asked whether these were put together by the prophet or by one of his disciples out of his deliverances. A doubt has been raised by the passage xxx. 6–7, a piece which is related to the " burdens " of chaps. xxi.–xxii.; but the interconnection of xxx. 5 with verse 8 indicates a continuity of thought. Moreover, chaps. xxxiii.–xxxv. are inseparably bound together, as was long ago recognized by Ewald; the direction in xxxiv. 1 sqq. to all peoples to listen to the story of the coming judgment is parallel to that in xxxiii. 13 warning the nations to take to heart the judgment upon the Assyrian host. If they do this, they may be exempt from the general judgment to be executed upon the peoples hostile to Yahweh, which is to find its chief exemplification in the punishment of Idumea (xxxiv. 6). Yet when Ewald remarked that xxxv. must be regarded as Isaianic, while of xxxiv. so much can not be certainly affirmed, he was within the bounds of probability, since it is likely that the prophet here used earlier predictions. The passage xxxiv.–xxxv. would never have been taken for exilic had not first the waste in xxxv. been arbitrarily and unnaturally regarded as the desert between Babylon and Judea, and if, in the second place, the " book of Yahweh " of xxxiv. 16 had not been foolishly regarded as the book of our prophet. This book is indeed the book of the kingdom, in which the future world-king Yahweh has entered the names of his peoples with their provinces (Ps. lxxxvii.), a book that was known to Isaiah (iv. 3); while the play of this pictorial representation of the depopulation of a land exactly corresponds to that in xxxiii. 23, in xxx. 32–33, 23–24, and to the taunting, enigmatical character which all these discourses show. If now chaps. xxxiii.–xxxv. belong together as a sixth discourse, Isaiah is the originator, and the present arrangement corresponds to his intention. Then the foreign elements, whether by another author or by himself from another occasion, can not be separated from the whole. It is a distortion to regard xxviii. 1–6 as an oracle concerning Samaria; rather is xxviii. the first of six oracles about Judah and Jerusalem, dating from the time before the fall of the northern kingdom as a state, and belonging with iv. 2 sqq., as the resemblance between that passage and xxviii. 5–6 shows. It is true that here, as in ii.–iv., the prophet has employed other oracles, either his own or those of another prophet; moreover, to remove xxviii. 1–6 would leave what followed without a beginning and destroy the cycle of oracles. Accordingly the prophet and the editor of these six deliverances are essentially the same, while the relation is different from that in xl.–lxvi. But the editor put these passages before xxxvi.–xxxix. as he put xl.–lxvi. after them because of their formally and essentially similar situation. Isaiah could not publish this book without indicating his part in it; and it is possible that Isa. i. was the introduction to the book xxviii.–xxxv. when Isaiah or his disciple published it as a monument of his activity in the brilliant prophetic period of Hezekiah for the following generation, and that the editor inserted between i. and xxviii. the parts which have their own titles (ii. 1 and xiii. 1).

5. Chapters ii.–xii.

There is now in our possession an assured basis from which to consider and decide how far the two sections ii.–xii. and xiii.–xxvii., which bear Isaiah's name, do so with justice. There is not only a large number of parallels with chaps. xxviii.–xxxix., but there is a remarkable agreement in situation, in spite of the intermingling of varied fragments and complete sections. There come out particularly the ingratitude and obstinacy of Judah and Jerusalem and the consequently necessary purging by punishment (ii.–iv.). It seems credible that Isaiah himself arranged ii.–iv.; and as he surely wrote vi. and xii. as components of a connected whole, all the individual parts of v.–xii. are traceable to him, though that interpolations have taken place need not be denied. It is possible that these last were, according to the custom of the times, attributed to Isaiah, and that the editor had the book in manuscript form before him in which the individual pieces had been inserted unintelligently among others which were then laid aside or put in other connections, and that transpositions were made which brought these parts into positions earlier or later in the book than they originally occupied.

6. Chapters xiii.–xxvii.

In the second part, which separates into the four " burdens " of xiii.–xviii. and the six of xix.–xxiii., there are certain guiding threads which come both from i.–xii. and from xxviii.–xxxv. The " burden " of the beasts of the South in xxx. 6 sqq. finds its counterparts in the " burdens " of xix.–xxiii.; and xxxiv. 1 sqq. agrees with xviii. 3. On the other hand, the note of the leveling of the heights found in chap ii. is repeated in xix. and xxiii., while the doing away of the lordship of Jacob and of the remains of Damascus in xviii. 12 sqq. is anticipated in viii. 7–10. Indeed, chap. xviii. comes into connection with both xi. 11 and lxvi. 20–21 in its thought of the return of the Hebrews from distant lands. The " burdens " are marked out from all other prophetic oracles by the fact that they bear the impress of having been delivered in the ecstatic state, and besides this they deal with the immense or the distant in time. They take on a different coloring entirely from those prophecies which come out of the prophet's own life or relate to the history of the times. Thus it comes about that they are separated from the other deliverances of the prophet and appear as cycles of deliverances distinguished by their tone. So their titles arise from a catchword, or a subject, or a locality, or an emblem, some of which can be shown to rest upon mistakes of the text (xxi. 1). Under these circumstances it is necessary to ask whether they are arranged after the literary ideas of the prophet Isaiah. It is remarkable that the oracle on Philistia (xiv. 29 sqq.), the people on the western border, passes on in xv.–xvi. to Moab and Edom, on the east and southeast, and in xvii. 1 to Damascus and the Holy Land in order to portray the extreme need in Israel and the overpowering revolution in the salvation of Jerusalem (xviii. 7). This corresponds to the way in which Amos reached the expression of the judgment upon Israel (Amos i.–ii). In xv.–xvi. Isaiah has so remodeled an old prophecy that it now has a relation to the foregoing " burden "; x. 5–12 is specifically Isaianic, so that the arrangement of at least three of these "burdens" is his. But there is a clear connection of these with the oracle in xvii. 12–xviii. 7, which shows a deliverance in Zion and the substitution of the government of a Davidic rule in place of that of the condemned tyrant of the peoples. This tyrant, the king of the satirical song in xiv. 4 sqq., is an ideal representation of the tyranny which is opposed to God, which subdues the world and oppresses God's people, but is cast into the depth of Hades. By his overthrow Yahweh frees the world of its incubus, and Zion becomes the refuge of the peoples under the Davidic dynasty. Similarly, the downfall of Babylon is pictured in xiii., and it is possible that in chap xix. the tyrant who oppresses the Egyptians is this same ideal tyrant by whose overthrow Egypt is to become a province of Canaan. The explanation of the position of xxi.–xxii. between the entirely parallel " burdens " of xix.–xx. and xxiii. is more difficult. In xxi. clearly the fate of heathen cities is determined by the decrees of Yahweh, for the execution of which the watchers are waiting. Chap. xxii. shows a contrast in the view of the valley of vision, where the watcher bewails the coming misfortune, while in the second part the expectations of Shebna for a quiet death and honorable burial in a chosen place are predicted to be baseless. The two chapters seem to show the necessity of the purgation of sin through death, out of which resurrection is to come. But this is related to the portrayal in xxiv. The succeeding chapters seem to portray like processes through which alike Israel and the nations are to pass, the particular judgments upon the nations which have been passed in review being generalized until there comes into view the salvation of the once rejected people, awakened into new life (xxvi. 1–19, cf. ix. 2). So that in the second half the ruling idea is the universal kingdom of Yahweh as it arises out of the judgment of the nations and the humiliation of human might and centers of power, the earthly representation of which is the throne and city of David raised to a glorious eminence.

7. Results of the Investigation.

The transmission and arrangement of this book demand of the reader that he view as the source of its peculiar prophetic content and as its predictive subject the historically known Isaiah, who orally and by writing sought to mold public opinion and reared up by esoteric instruction the followers and disciples (viii. 16 sqq., lix. 21) who were heirs of his prophecy to continue his testimony. These heirs of Isaianic prophecy received his testimony and made it fruitful partly by publishing in book form his oral and written testimony for " Judah and Jerusalem " (i. 1), and partly by reproducing in the circles of the faithful the esoteric instruction given them (xlviii. 16) and making it the basis and guide of their addresses. In order to preserve essentially and in completeness the testimony of Isaiah, these developments of Isaianic contents required later fixation in writing and union with the then existing book of Isaiah. Since the author of the addition in lxiii. 7–lxvi. 24, whose theodicy reproduces Isaianic declarations, looked back upon the destruction of the temple, and since the preacher of xli. 1 sqq. had seen the victorious march of Cyrus, the origin of the present book is later than 550 B.C. This method of treating the Isaianic deliverances, apart from other results, was worked out in abbreviations (as in ii.–iv.), enrichment (as in the lyrics of the Deutero–Isaiah), and reinterpretation (e.g., xiv. 5 sqq.). In view of these results fuller justice is done the book if its relation to the historical Isaiah is the guide to its exegesis than if the tradition regarding its authorship is disregarded and its authors are scattered along through the centuries.

(August Klostermann.)

1. The Problem.

III. The Critical View: The Book of Isaiah in its present form is very generally regarded as possessing a certain unity of plan and purpose. The traditional view has from time immemorial discovered, in this unity, the pen of a single author, Isaiah, the contemporary of Hezekiah, while recent critical scholarship maintains that this writing was arranged and edited by some unknown scribe or scribes, acting as diaskeuasts in the first quarter of the first century B.C. In a little over a quarter of a century, after Döderlein (1775) in his commentary on Isaiah first threw serious doubt on the genuineness of Isa. xl.–lxvi., a fragmentary hypothesis of the origin of this prophetic work gradually gained in popularity. The latter view was first enunciated by Koppe in his notes to Bishop Lowth's work on Isaiah (1779–81). Koppe's theory, that the canonical Book of Isaiah was made up of eighty-five fragments, never won general acceptance as it was strenuously opposed by the Hebraist Gesenius and the commentator Hitzig. But a new form of the fragmentary hypothesis (see below, §§ 3 sqq.), differing materially from that of Koppe, has won many adherents among Biblical scholars since it was brilliantly advocated by Duhm (1892), Cheyne (1895), and Marti (1900).

2. Structure of the Book.

To understand fully the history of critical opinion, and especially its latest phases, one must note the structure of the book. All commentators, modern as well as ancient, have observed the threefold division into which the Book of Isaiah naturally falls: (1) i.–xxxv., (2) xxxvi.–xxxix., (3) xl.–lxvi. The second of these groups, giving an account of Isaiah's activity in the crisis produced by Sennacherib's invasion, 701 B.C., was excerpted from the Book of Kings. Chapters xxxvi.–xxxix. form the dividing line between the two main sections of the work. The passages on one side differ from those on the other in historical background, point of view, theological conceptions, diction and phraseology. The earlier chapters reflect the historical changes and movements of 740–701 B.C.; the monarchs mentioned—Hezekiah, Sargon (xx. 1), Sennacherib (xxxvi., xxxvii. 17, 21, 37), and Merodach-Baladan (xxxix. 1)—are those of the eighth century. In the third section (xl.–lxvi.) Cyrus is in the flood tide of his victorious career (xliv. 28, xlv.; cf. xli. 2–3, 25, etc.); the Assyrian has disappeared from the stage of history, and in his stead Israel's oppressors are the Babylonians (xliii. 14, 25, xlvii. 1 sqq., xlviii. 14, 20). In the third section Jerusalem is described as lying in ruins and desolate (xliv. 26b, lviii. 12, lxi. 4, lxiii. 18, lxiv. 10–11), while in the first part she is still standing, the object of her enemies' attacks and the special ward of Jehovah (i.–xxix. 1–8, 36–39). In addition to these distinguishing features, the two parts differ greatly in spirit; the latter is a book of consolation, the very first word being "comfort" (xl. 1), while the former is made up of threatening and judgment, the tone of arraignment struck in chap. i. appearing in one form or other clear through to chap. xxxv. While in this connection stress is not laid upon the fact that the phraseology is in striking contrast, as this frequently leads to a mechanical argument, the difference in diction may not be passed over lightly, as the careful reader notices the change even in the English version, while one accustomed to using Hebrew almost instinctively notes the passing from a piece of literature in a style "condensed, lapidary and plastic," to one that is clear and flowing. In chaps. i.–xxxix. the emphasis is laid upon the majesty of Yahweh (ii. 10 sqq., 17, 19 sqq., x. 5 sqq., etc.), in xl.–lxvi. on his infinitude (xl. 12–26–xli. 4, etc.), in the third section the personal Messiah is depicted as the righteous and suffering servant (xlii. 1–4, xlix. 1–6, l. 4–9, lii. 13–liii. 12) instead of the ideal king of the future (vii. 14, ix. 1–6, xi. 1–5).

3. Results of Criticism.

Such differences as these were deemed valid grounds for dating Isa. xl.–lxvi. in the sixth century by almost every great commentator of the last century (Gesenius, Ewald, Knobel, Dillmann, Delitzsch in his last edition, Cheyne, Orelli, Duhm, G. A. Smith). Dillmann characterized this view as "one of the surest results of modern literary investigation." Since Delitzsch in the fourth edition of his commentary (1889) went over to this position, it may truthfully be said that no scientific exegetical work has held to the traditional view of the unity of the Book of Isaiah. In America the assignment of Isa. xl.–lxvi. to the sixth century was strenuously opposed in magazine articles by Prof. W. H. Green of Princeton (*Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, vol. iii.), but this school of theology has produced no work of exposition on the prophecies of Isaiah since the appearance of that commentary of first rank by J. A. Alexander (1846, rev. ed. 1865). The argument from "the analogy of prophecy" worked this complete revolution in critical opinion. That a prophet primarily addresses his contemporaries; that, however far he may project himself into the future, his point of departure is his own age; that he paints the distant scene of the remotest future in the colors of his own day; that he plants his feet firmly upon the events of his own time, before he attempts to scan the distant horizon—these are principles recognized as axiomatic by all interpreters of prophecy. If they are correctly assumed, Isa. xl.–lxvi. can not be assigned to Isaiah, the son of Amoz. In fact, the exilic background of these chapters has been recognized by some of the most zealous defenders of the Isaianic authorship, but it has been attributed to "the prophet's ideal point of view" (Keil; cf. Hengstenberg).

4. Analysis of Isaiah i.-xxxix.

Having attained this result, criticism did not halt, for the argument from the analogy of prophecy will not leave the first part of the work intact (chaps. i.–xxxv.). As early as Eichhorn (1783) it was applied to this section, and resulted in the denial of the genuineness of a number of passages. (1) The oracle on the fall of Babylon (xiii. 1–xiv. 23) was assigned to the Babylonian exile, because the Medes are mentioned as the instruments of the destruction (xiii. 17), and Babylon is described as the supreme world power of that age (xiii. 11, 19, xiv. 4–5, 12 sqq., 16–17). (2) In the critical disposition of passages, xxi. 1–10 is naturally associated with xiii. 1–xiv. 23, for in it the prophet describes the fall of Babylon, and refers to Elam and Media (verse 2) in terms which would be more natural to a prophet of the sixth century than to Isaiah of the eighth. (3) With these two sections just noted go chaps. xxxiv. and xxxv. The latter is a beautiful lyric which is a mosaic of phrases and imagery borrowed from Deutero-Isaiah (the title provisionally assigned to the author of part three); the former is assigned to the exile, because of the bitter hatred and dire vengeance against Edom which it breathes (xxxiv. 5 sqq., 8 sqq.; cf. Ps. cxxxvii. 7). (4) While, in regard to the section Isa. xxiv.–xxvii. there is a general agreement that it is not the work of Isaiah, no consensus of opinion has been reached as to the age to which it should be assigned. Conservative critics are inclined to be satisfied with placing it in the days of the Persian empire. Dates, varying from the reign of Darius Hystaspis (520–485) to that of Artaxerxes Ochus (359–339), have been given. Here the argument from Biblical theology overshadows that based upon the analogy of prophecy. No explicit historical references occur; the imagery is apocalyptic in character, which in itself points to the age of the decay of prophecy. The writer's ideas of the future life—immortality, xxv. 8, and the resurrection, xxvi. 19—are distinct advances on those of Isaiah's age, but the traces of Persian angelology commonly alleged are not so evident. Critical opinion is divided about the age of chap. xxiii. The only reason for denying the Isaianic character of this passage is the occurrence of the phrase "Behold the land of the Chaldeans" (verse 13). The text is extremely uncertain and has led to emendations; instead of Chaldeans, Ewald suggested Canaanites, and Duhm offers Chittim. It may justly be regarded as an Isaianic passage to be assigned either to 723 or to 701 B.C. Such was the view of critical scholarship before the rise of the modern fragmentary hypothesis which has been advocated by Duhm and Marti in their commentaries (1892, 1900), and by Cheyne in his *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (1895). These three exegetes leave only a very small part of chaps. i.–xxxix. to Isaiah, and Cheyne has tersely enunciated the principles and results of this school, "It is too bold to maintain that we still have any collection of Isaianic prophecies which in its present form goes back to the period of the prophet" (*EB*, ii. 2194). Cheyne in his *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* assigns only the following passages of i.–xxxix. to Isaiah: i. 5–31, ii. 6–21, iii. 1, 4–5, 8–9 (2–3, 6–7 may be Isaianic), 12–15, 16–17, 24, v. 1–14, 17–22, 23–25b, 26–29, vi. 1–13, vii. 2–8a, 9–14, 16, 18–20, viii. 1–4, 5–6, 7a, 8–18, ix. 7–12, 15–x. 4, x. 5–9, 13,–14, 28–32, xiv. 24–27 (omit 25b), 29–32, xvi. 14, xvii. 1–6, 9–14, xviii. 1–6, xx. 1, 3–6, xxi. 16 sqq., xxii. 1–5, 6–9a, 11b–14, 15a, 16–18, xxiii. 1–2, 3(?), 4, 6–12, 14, xxviii. 1–4, 7–19, 21–22, xxix. 1–4a, 6, 9–10, 13–14, xxix. 15, xxx. 1–7a, 8–17b, xxxi. 1–5a.

5. Analysis of Isaiah xl.–lxvi.

Before the advent of this fragmentary school, Isa. xl.–lxvi. was looked upon as a literary unity, and was attributed to a single prophet, commonly termed the "Great Unknown of the Exile" or Deutero-Isaiah. This prophecy was regarded as falling into three sections marked by the refrain xlviii. 22, lvii. 21 (Rückert, Hitzig, and Delitzsch). Ewald first propounded a theory, the forerunner of the one now to be considered. He maintained that Isa. xl.–lxvi. was a collection of "pamphlets or fly-leaves which the surging stream of time drew forth, one after another, from the prophet." The writer arranged these pamphlets in two books, xl.–xlviii., xlix.–lx., to which were added an epilogue, lxi. 1–lxiii. 6, and an appendix, lxiii. 7–lxvi. 24. According to Ewald, Deutero-Isaiah borrowed xl. 1, 2, lii. 13–liii. 12, lvi. 9–lvii. 11 from a prophet of Manasseh's reign, and lvii. 1–lix. 20 from a contemporary of Ezekiel. Dillmann and his school have always stood for the substantial unity of this section of the Book of Isaiah (cf. Dillmann's *Kommentar*, ed. Kittel, Leipsic, 1898). The earlier efforts to deny the unity of Deutero-Isaiah bore fruit in the commentary of Duhm already mentioned. In this epoch-making book, Duhm maintained that Isa. xl.–lxvi. is the work of three different writers. (1) Deutero-Isaiah is reduced to xl.–lv., and then one-fourth of its contents is subtracted as later additions. Deutero-Isaiah is supposed to have written his work about 540 B.C. in Lebanon or Phenicia. Duhm regards the following verses as later additions: xl. 5, 31b, xli. 5, xlii. 12, 15–24, xliii. 20b, 21, xliv. 9–20, 28b, xlv. 10, 13b, xlvi. 6–8, xlvii. 3a, 14b, xlviii. 1 in part, 2, 4, 5b, 7b, 8b–10, 16b–19, 22, l. 10, 11, li. 11, 16, 18, lii. 3–6, liv. 15, 17b, lv. 3a, 7. (2) From chaps. xl.–lv. several passages, the so-called "Servant of Yahweh Songs" (xlii. 1–4, xlix. 1–6, l. 4–9, lii. 13–liii. 12), were exscinded and assigned to a later date. Duhm takes pains to show that these lyrics are dependent on Jeremiah, Job, and Deutero-Isaiah, although the last-named does not show any acquaintance with them. The Servant of Yahweh Songs were read by Trito-Isaiah, and influenced Malachi; the literary connections thus traced point to a member of the Jewish Church of the first half of the fifth century B.C. as their author. Marti differs from Duhm in regarding these songs as an integral part of Deutero-Isaiah. (3) The closing section, chaps. lvi.–lxvi., is attributed to a third writer, who is designated Trito-Isaiah. He writes in the same measure as Deutero-Isaiah, imitates his style, and agrees with him in proclaiming the future glory of Jerusalem. From the internal evidence, it is argued that he was a resident of Jerusalem, and wrote shortly before the mission of Nehemiah. It is to be noted that Cheyne analyzes this section, and regards it as a compilation from several sources.

6. Conclusion.

Sanity and common sense suggest that the literary criticism of the fragmentists has overreached itself. The arguments from the analogy of prophecy and Biblical theology as applied by Cheyne, Duhm, and Marti necessarily imply a minute knowledge of history such as we do not possess. While this is true, historical criticism has reached some assured results. It has been proved that chaps. xxxvi.–xxxix. were excerpted from the Book of Kings, and certain passages of chaps. i.–xxxix. can not have been written by Isaiah (see above). The literary history of chaps. xl.–lxvi. is not as simple as it once was supposed to be. Of these chapters, xl.–lv. may confidently be assigned to Deutero-Isaiah, xl.–xlviii. being written in the exile (c. 546), and xlix.–lv. in Palestine shortly after the return. The manner and date of origin of lvii.–lxvi. can not be determined with certainty; probably they were written in the age of Ezra and Nehemiah, and were the product of a school of writers rather than of a single pen. JAMES A. KELSO.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the Life and Times of Isaiah the best work is S. R. Driver, *Isaiah, his Life and Times*, London, 1893. Consult further: A. H. Sayce, *Life and Times of Isaiah Illustrated by Contemporary Monuments*, ib. 1889; J. Meinhold, *Jesaia und seine Zeit*, Freiburg, 1898; R. Sinker, *Hezekiah and His Age*, ib. 1897; F. Küchler, *Die Stellung des Propheten Jesaia zum Politik seiner zeit*, Tübingen, 1906; *DB*, ii. 485–486; *EB*, ii. 2180–2190; *JE*, vi. 635–636; F. Wilke, *Jesaja und Assur*, Leipsic, 1905.

On the text consult A. Klostermann, *Deuterojesaja*, Munich, 1893; T. K. Cheyne, *Notes and Criticisms on the Hebrew Text of Isaiah*, London, 1868; idem, *Isaiah*, in *SBOT;* idem, *Critica Biblica*, London, 1904; R. L. Ottley, *Book of Isaiah according to the LXX.*, 2 vols., New York, 1904–07; G. H. Box, *The Book of Isaiah*, London, 1908.

The two best commentaries on the book are by F. Delitzsch, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1889, Eng. transl., 2 vols., London, 1891–92 (conservative), and J. Skinner, in *Cambridge Bible*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1896–98 (critical). The book has been constantly the subject of comment, the most noteworthy of which is contained in the works of C. Vitringa, 2 vols., Basel, 1732; R. Lowth, London, 1778 and often (marked out new lines by introducing the subject of the poetry of the book); W. Gesenius, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1821 (philological); F. Hitzig, Heidelberg, 1833; F. J. V. D. Maurer, Leipsic, 1835; E. Henderson, London, 1857; H. Ewald, Stuttgart, 1868, Eng. transl., London, 1875–80; K. A. Knobel, ed. L. Diestel, Leipsic, 1872; J. A. Alexander, 2 vols., New York, 1875; W. Kay, in *Bible Commentary*, New York, 1875; B. Neteler, Münster, 1876; F. W. Weber, Nördlingen, 1876; S. R. Driver and A. Neubauer, *The 53d Chapter of Isaiah according to Jewish Interpreters*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1876–77; A. le Hir, Paris, 1877; S. Sharpe, London, 1877; W. Urwick, *The Servant of Jehovah, Is. lii. 13–liii. 12*, Edinburgh, 1877; T. R. Birks, London, 1878; A. Heiligstedt, Halle, 1878; K. W. E. Nägelsbach, Bielefeld, 1877, Eng. transl., New York, 1878 (in Lange); F. Köstlin, Berlin, 1879; J. W. Nutt, Commentary on Isaiah by *Rabbi Eleazer of Beaugenci, with Notice of Mediaeval French and Spanish Exegesis*, London, 1879; J. M. Rodwell, ib. 1881; T. K. Cheyne, *The Book of Isaiah Chronologically Arranged*, London, 1884; *Commentary*, 2 vols., ib. 1881–84; G. A. Smith, 2 vols., 1890; H. G. Mitchell, *Isaiah i.–xii.*, New York, 1897; A. Dillmann, ed. R. Kittel, Leipsic, 1898; E. König, *The Exiles' Book of Consolation*, Edinburgh, 1899; A. Condamin, Paris, 1905.

On the subject of the "Servant" consult: J. Forbes, *The Servant of the Lord in Is. xl.–lxvi.*, Edinburgh, 1870; M. Schian, *Die Ebed-Jahweh-Lieder in Jes. 40–66*, Leipsic, 1894; K. Budde, *Die sogenannten Ebed-Jahwe-Lieder*, Giessen, 1900; F. Giesebrecht, *Der Knecht Jahwes des Deuterojesaia*, Königsberg, 1902; H. Roy, *Israel und die Welt in Jes. 40–55, . . . Ebed-Jahwe-Frage*, Leipsic, 1903; G. C. Workman, *The Servant of Jehovah; or, the Passion-Prophecy of Scripture*, London, 1907.

For Criticism and Introduction the most thorough-going work is T. K. Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, London, 1895. Various questions and phases are discussed in: C. P. Caspari, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Buch Jesaja*, Berlin, 1848; Löhr, *Zur Frage über die Echtheit von Jesaias 40–66*, 3 parts, Berlin, 1878–80; H. Krüger, *La Théologie d'Esaie 40–66*, Paris, 1881; J. Barth, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Jesaja*, Carlsruhe, 1885; H. Guthe, *Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaia*, Leipsic, 1885; F. Giesebrecht, *Beiträge zur Jesaia-Kritik*, Göttingen, 1890; J. Kennedy, *A Popular Argument for the Unity of Isaiah*, London, 1891; J. Ley, *Jes. 40–66*, Marburg, 1893; G. C. M. Douglas, *Isaiah One and His Book One*, London, 1895; M. Brückner, *Komposition des . . . Jes. 28–33*, Halle, 1897; J. Meinhold, *Die Isajaerzählungen Jes. 36–39*, Göttingen, 1898; A. Bertholet, *Zu Jesaja 53*, Tübingen, 1899; E. Littmann, *Ueber die Abfassungszeit des Tritojesaia*, Freiburg, 1899; E. Selim, *Das Rätsel des deuterojesajanischen Buches*, Leipsic, 1908; Smith, *Prophets*; *DB*, ii. 485–499; *EB*, ii. 2189–2208; *JE*, vi. 636–642; and the general works on Introduction to the Bible and to the O. T., and on O. T. Theology.

ISAIAH, MARTYRDOM OF. See Pseudepigrapha, IV., 34.

ISENMANN (more correctly **Isenmenger** or **Eisenmenger**), **JOHANN:** German reformer; b. at Schwäbisch Hall (35 m. n.e. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, c. 1495; d. at the monastery of Anhausen on the Brenz (near Heidenheim, in Württemberg, 20 m. n.n.e. of Ulm) Feb. 18, 1574. He studied at the University of Heidelberg in Apr., 1514, became dean of the classical faculty on Dec. 20, 1521; was called to Hall as pastor in the spring of 1524, and then wrought for twenty-four years with Brenz for the Reformation in that place. The festival of Corpus Christi was abolished in 1524; at Christmas, 1525, the Lord's Supper was observed by Evangelical rite; and in 1526, an Evangelical liturgy was introduced. Isenmann took an eager part in the *Syngramma Suevicum* in 1525 (see Brenz, Johann, § 2). He became superintendent in 1542. At the beginning of 1546 he reformed the imperial town of Wimpfen. Heavy tribulation ensued from the Schmalkald War, with the emperor's triumphant entrance to Hall, Dec., 1546; and the situation grew still more dangerous during the Interim, which both Isenmann and Brenz rejected. When the Spaniards came, the council had to dismiss Evangelical preachers. In July, 1549, Isenmann removed to Württemberg, and became preacher at Urach. Soon afterward he became pastor at Tübingen, and general superintendent of the southwest district. He enjoyed the confidence of the new duke. In 1551 he went with Jakob Beurlin (q.v.) to Langensalza and Leipsic to have the Württemberg Confession subscribed by Melanchthon and the theologians of Wittenberg and Leipsic. In the summer of 1557 he accompanied the duke to the diet at Frankfort, and collaborated in the great *Apologia confessionis Wirtembergicae*. In 1558 he was appointed abbot at Anhausen, where he spent the remainder of his life. G. Bossert.

Bibliography: L. M. Fischlin, *Memoria theologorum Wirtembergensium*, i. 53, Leipsic, 1710; J. Hartmann and C. Jäger, *Johann Brenz*, 2 vols., Hamburg, 1840–42; T. Pressel, *Anecdota Brentiana*, 2 vols., Tübingen, 1868; G. Bossert, *Das Interim in Württemberg*, Halle, 1895; *ADB*, xiv. 634.

ISHBOSHETH: According to II Sam. ii.–iv. a son of Saul, whom his uncle, Abner, set on the throne of Israel at Mahanaim after the slaughter by the Philistines at Gilboa. In I Chron. viii. 33, ix. 39 he is called Esh-baal (Hebr. *Eshba'al*, a contraction of *Ishba'al*, "man of the Lord," i.e., of Yahweh); when the use of the name "Baal" was shunned, and *bosheth*, "shame," substituted for it (see Baal, § 5), the form Ishbosheth became common. That in the Hebrew text the original form was *Ishba'al* is shown by the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, Itala, and the Septuagint codex 93 Holmes. The original form remains in Chronicles probably because those books were read and copied less frequently than Samuel. The Chronicler names Ishbosheth fourth of the sons of Saul after Jonathan, Malchi-shua and Abinadab. I Sam. xxxi. 2 does not name him, I Sam. xiv. 49 names Jonathan, Ishui, and Malchi-shua. The order here indicates that Ishbosheth was the youngest son of Saul, and that is the more probable since he was dependent upon Abner, since there is no mention of his wife or children, and since he is not named among Saul's sons who were in the battle with the Philistines. The age given him in II Sam. ii. 10 does not agree with the indications of the context, according to which David and Jonathan were not yet forty years old at the time of the battle of Gilboa; the item belongs to the later chronological insertions.

Abner, a cousin of Saul, after the battle of Gilboa sought to save for Israel as much as he might of Saul's achievements, and had Ishbosheth set up as king beyond the Jordan at Mahanaim, where he was recognized by Gilead, Asher, Jezreel, Ephraim, and Benjamin—practically all Israel. Judah and the South had made David king there, though under tributary relations with the Philistines; and for his possessions west of the Jordan Ishbosheth was also a vassal of the Philistines. The strife which arose between Israel and Judah, the first indication of which is given in II Sam. ii. 12 sqq., was suffered by the overlords, and continued with increasing success for David. Finally Abner took offense at the complaint of Ishbosheth because the former had married one of Saul's concubines, and told Ishbosheth that he would influence Israel to choose David king, a threat which he proceeded to fulfil. David thereupon demanded of Ishbosheth the return of his former wife, Michal, thus forcing recognition of his relationship to Saul's household, the way having been paved by negotiations between himself and Abner (II Sam. iii. 12 sqq.). At the defection of Abner Ishbosheth lost heart, and he was soon after assassinated by two of his military officers, who thought in this way to secure their own advancement. They carried his head to David; but being a member of the house of Saul, David at once punished the murder by the execution of the murderers.

This is the course of the Judaic narrative in II

Sam. ii.–iv. Were the Ephraimitic account extant, possibly the coloring of the story might be somewhat changed. Two points in the story appear trustworthy: that David wished to be recognized as the son-in-law of Saul, and that he was innocent of the death of Ishbosheth. The length of Ishbosheth's reign was probably a little less than that of David in Hebron (II Sam. vi. 5). (H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Kamphausen, in *ZATW*, vi (1886), 43–97; the literature under SAMUEL, BOOKS OF; and the pertinent sections of the works cited under AHAB.

ISHMAEL (Hebr. *Yishma'el*, "God hears"; LXX., *Ismaēl*): The son of Abraham by Hagar (q.v.), an Egyptian slave. He was born in the house of Abraham and was included in the covenant of circumcision (Gen. xvii. 25, P). Since, however, it was the will of God that Isaac should be the sole heir of the covenant blessings, the Lord commanded Abraham to accede to the demands of his wife Sarah that Ishmael be driven from the house. After this enforced flight, a divine revelation came to Hagar (Gen. xxi., E), as she was driven to despair for her son, who was dying of thirst in the " desert of Beersheba." That this vision is only another version of that recounted in chap. xvi. (Hupfeld, Dillmann, and others) can not be maintained, since the details of the divine appearance are entirely different and there is also a difference between the chronology of P and that of E, the former (Gen. xvii. 25) making Ishmael at least fifteen years of age at the time, while E (Gen. xxi.) regards him as still a child of tender years (cf. the LXX. of xxi. 14 which says expressly: " and she placed the child upon her shoulder ").

The especial importance of Ishmael lies in the relation of his descendants to Israel. They were to have no claim on the promised inheritance of the people of God, but were destined to multiply and spread. These descendants are characterized by the words of the angel concerning the ancestor himself (Gen. xvi. 12): " And he will be a wild man; his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him," thus sketching with a few strokes the spirit and manner of life of the Bedouins. According to Gen. xvi. 12, they were to dwell farther to the eastward than their brothers, and in fact they had possession of the desert east of Palestine, occupying also the country to the south, from the Persian Gulf to the northeastern boundary of Egypt. They spread out over the whole of northern Arabia, and therefore their ethnic designation, Ishmaelites, is used generally for the tribes of northern Arabia, including also the Midianites. Twelve peoples of northern Arabia are derived from Ishmael in Gen. xxv. 12 sqq. (P), where the genealogy is more ethnographic than is usually the case in the histories of the patriarchs. Ishmael is, however, a primitive personal name which occurs in ancient Arabic inscriptions, and in this case the leader gave his name to the tribe, although all the groups of peoples which are brought into connection with him were not his actual descendants. That Israel recognized its blood-relationship with these tribes rests upon a correct tradition. The Mohammedan Arabs, who proudly reckon Ishmael among their ancestors, say that he and his mother were buried in the Kaaba at Mecca (Abulfeda, *Historia anteislamica*, ed. H. O. Fleischer, pp. 24 sqq., Leipsic, 1831; E. Pocock, *Specimen historiae Arabum*, pp. 6–7, 177, 506–507, Oxford, 1806; B. d' Herbelot, *Bibliothèque orientale*, Maestricht, 1776, s.vv. " Hagar," " Ismael," " Ischak ").

(C. VON ORELLI.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult, besides the literature under ISAAC and ARABIA: A. H. Sayce, *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, pp. 201–202, London, 1894; T. P. Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam*, pp. 216–220, ib. 1896; *DB*, ii. 502–505; *EB*, ii. 2211–2215; the appropriate sections in works on the history of Israel and the commentaries on Genesis.

ISHTAR. See ASHTORETH; ASSYRIA, VII.; BABYLONIA, VII., 2, § 7, 3, § 5.

ISIDORE MERCATOR: A fictitious person, the alleged author of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals (q.v.). He was formerly erroneously identified with Isidore of Seville; hence the name Pseudo-Isidore.

ISIDORE OF PELUSIUM: Egyptian abbot; b. at Alexandria probably before 370; d. near Pelusium (135 m. e. of Alexandria) about 440. He was presbyter and abbot in a cloister at the east mouth of the Nile, not far from Pelusium. It can not be proved that he was a pupil of John Chrysostom; but he was spiritually akin to him, and highly valued his writings. There are preserved more than 2,000 of his letters, mostly brief notes, but frequently of great length, which show him to have been a highly esteemed spiritual counselor, thoroughly aglow with holy earnestness; a very shepherd of souls, and a teacher versed in Scripture.

Isidore was an example of Greek monasticism in its noblest form. For him the practical philosophy of the disciples of Christ (i. 63 and elsewhere) throve only in withdrawal from the world, in voluntary poverty and abstinence. The soul could not discern God (i. 402) in the bustle of everyday life; only in the utmost emancipation from worldly wants did it approach divine freedom (ii. 19). Yet asceticism and flight from the world did not alone suffice: the garland of all virtues must be woven in monasticism, the peculiar dangers of which, however, did not escape Isidore. But though retired from the world, he still took part in the need and perils of Christianity, supporting, exhorting, wherever he could reach with his written message. He appeared to great advantage in his attitude toward Cyril of Alexandria. While at one with him in dogmatic opposition to Nestorius, he still perceived Cyril's intriguing spirit, and warned him against blind passion (i. 310); frankly warning the emperor, too, against the disorder provoked by the interference of his courtiers in dogmatic affairs (i. 311). But when Cyril, content with the fact that Nestorius had been dropped by the Antiochians, allowed some dogmatic concessions to his opponents, he had to hear the admonition from Isidore that he should stand fast, and not himself become a heretic (i. 324). Isidore took to heart the dignity of the priesthood, and with great earnestness did he remind negligent ecclesiastics of their serious accountability. He thus very persistently rebuked Bishop Eusebius of Pelusium and his clergy, because they trafficked in priestly offices, suffered their congregations to decay, chose rather to build sumptuous churches than to care for the poor, and caused offense by their scandalous behavior. In patriarchal fashion, moreover, he concerned himself with all manner of human needs, nor feared, in so doing, the great of this earth. He fervently exhorted the emperor to mildness and liberality (i. 35). For the weal of the town, he addressed himself to the civil authorities (ii. 25), and interceded with their masters in behalf of slaves who fled to him for protection. Of literary training himself, he granted that the Christian, like the bee, might suck honey from the teachings of the philosophers (ii. 3).

Dogmatically orthodox, and a zealous opponent of all heresies, he directed his attention especially toward the doctrinal questions of weight for practical Christianity (sin, freedom, grace). He was of greater significance, however, as an exegete. For him the Scriptural truth was the heavenly treasure in earthen vessels. The expositor should approach his task with devout conviction; dwelling not upon separate words, but on the entire connection. Still he was given to many an arbitrary allegory: particularly in his Christological views of passages in the Old Testament. At the same time, in the exposition of the Old Testament he would not have the historical sense annulled by the mystical and prophetic; and he made attempts besides at explanations of points of grammar and subject matter. G. KRÜGER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: An ed. of the *Opera* was published Paris, 1638, and in *MPG*, lxxviii. 103–1046, 1647–1674. Consult: *ASB*, Feb., i. 468–473; J. Fessler, *Institutiones patrologiae*, ed. B. Jungmann, ii. 2, pp. 128–143, Innsbruck, 1896; *DCB*, iii. 315–320; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xv. 97–119, 847; C. A. Heumann, *De Isidori Pelusiotae*, Göttingen, 1737; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, x. 480–494, Hamburg, 1807; H. A. Niemeyer, *De Isidori Pelusiotae*, Halle, 1825, and *MPG*, lxxviii. 9–102; P. B. Glück, *Isidoris Pelusiotae summa doctrinae moralis*, Würzburg, 1848; L. Bober, *De arte hermeneutica Isidoris Pelusiotae*, Cracow, 1878; O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, pp. 353–354, Freiburg, 1894; *KL*, vi. 964–969.

ISIDORE OF SEVILLE: Isidore, archbishop of Seville and encyclopedist, was born about 560, the place unknown; d. at Seville, Spain, Apr. 4, 636. He was a scion of a distinguished Roman family which had fled from Carthagena during the Gothic invasion, and was educated, after the death of his parents, by his brother Leander, whom he succeeded, apparently about 600, as archbishop of Seville. He attended the synod held by King Gundemar in 610, and presided over those held by King Sisebut at Seville in 619 and the famous Fourth Synod of Toledo under Sisenand in 633 (see TOLEDO, SYNODS OF).

Life.

His Influence and Importance.

Isidore's chief importance, however, was as an author, and his learning embraced the entire range possible in his age and country. Neither originality nor independent investigation, neither keen criticism nor elegance of presentation could be expected from him, but his manifold interest, reading, and diligence in collecting, excerpting, and compiling from all departments of theological and secular learning are unparalleled. His position in history is determined primarily by two works, the *Libri sententiarum*, the first dogmatics of the Latin Church, and the *Etymologiae*, the source of linguistic and practical knowledge for centuries, so that he became the schoolmaster of the Middle Ages. Gradually he became the national hero of the Spanish Church, and to him were attributed the Old Spanish or Mozarabic liturgy, the collection of Spanish canons upon which was based the forgery of the pseudo-Isidore, and even the collection of the laws of the West Gothic kings. The Roman Catholic Church, despite the weakness of the bonds which then united Spain and Rome, holds that he was a pupil of Gregory the Great, that he was vicar-apostolic in Spain, received the pallium, and took part in a Roman synod. Yet it is quite possible that he did not recognize the council of 553, and that he treated Justinian merely as a heretic who sought to overthrow the Chalcedonian Creed; while he did not mention the papacy in his ecclesiastical handbook, and he was even slightly heterodox in his views of the sacraments and grace.

His Writings.

The works of Isidore are thus enumerated according to a list by Braulio (in *MPL*, lxxxi. 15 sqq.), which seems, in the main, to follow chronological order: (1) *Prooemiorum liber unus*, an introduction to the Bible, consisting of a brief prologue on the canon in general and short tables of contents of the individual books. (2) *De ortu et obitu patrum*, or *De vita et morte sanctorum utriusque Testamenti*, short biographies of eighty-five characters of the Bible, sixty-four from the Old Testament and twenty-one from the New. The authenticity of the work has been doubted, but without sufficient reason. (3) *Officiorum libri duo*, usually called *De officiis ecclesiasticis*, written about 610, one of the most important works of Isidore for theology and ecclesiastical archeology. The first book, entitled *De origine officiorum*, discusses the origin and the authors of ecclesiastical worship, while the second, *De origine ministeriorum*, is devoted to the duties of the orders of clergy and various estates in life. (4) *De nominibus legis et evangeliorum liber*, evidently identical with the *Allegoriae quaedam sanctae scripturae* of the manuscripts and editions, and containing an allegorical interpretation of 129 names and passages from the Old Testament and 121 from the New. The work is of great value for the art and literature of the Middle Ages. (5) *De haeresibus liber*, which is probably identical with the list of Jewish and Christian heresies given in the fourth and fifth chapters of the eighth book of the *Etymologiae*. (6) *Sententiarum libri tres*, the chief theological work of its author, and the first Latin compend of faith and morals, chiefly in excerpts from Augustine and Gregory the Great. The first book is dogmatic in content, and treats of such subjects as the qualities of God, the origin of evil, the soul, and Christ, the seven rules of exegesis, the difference between the Testaments, creeds, baptism, the sacrament, and eschatology (but with no mention of purgatory). The second and third books are ethical, the former general and the latter special. The first discusses, among other subjects, the cardinal virtues, grace, election, conversion, backsliding, repentance, sin, conscience, virtue and vice. The last book discusses the estates of the Christian life, divine judgments, temptation, prayer, asceticism, temporal authorities, the brevity of human life, and similar topics. (7) *Contra Judaeos libri duo*, or *De fide catholica adversus Judaeos*, written at the request of his sister Florentina, and establishing the truth of the Christian religion from the prophecies of the Old Testament with special reference to the Jewish question in Spain. (8) *Monasticae regulae liber*, a system not differing essentially from the Benedictine rule, although in no way related to it. (9) *Quaestionum in Vetus Testamentum libri duo*, a mystical and allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament, consisting entirely of excerpts from Origen, Victorinus, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Fulgentius, Cassian, and especially from Gregory the Great. (10) *De viris illustribus sive de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, a continuation of the works of Jerome and Gennadius. It contains the biographies of fourteen Spaniards and thirty-two non-Spaniards, but is written for the most part in a superficial manner and composed in great measure of excerpts (which are frequently incorrect) from Rufinus, Cassiodorus, and Victor of Tunnuna, or from the works of the authors whom Isidore discusses. (11) *Chronicorum a principio mundi usque ad tempus suum liber*, from the creation to the Emperor Heraclius and King Sisebut (616), based on Julius Africanus, Eusebius-Jerome, and Victor of Tunnuna, while its division according to the "six ages of the world" was taken from Augustine's *City of God*. The work is extant in two recensions, as well as in an abridgment forming the fifth chapter of the *Etymologiae*. (12) *Historia Gothorum, Vandalorum et Suevorum*, also in two redactions, and containing a brief, but valuable, account of these three peoples, especially of the Goths from the earliest times to the fifth year of King Swintila (626). (13) *Libri differentiarum duo*, the first an alphabetical list of synonymous or homonymous words with their meanings, and the second an elucidation of various concepts. (14) *Synonymorum libri duo*, or according to Ildefonsus, *Libri lamentationum*, a collection of words and phrases in the form of a dialogue between the sinful soul and comforting "reason," which points it to penance and the forgiveness of sins. (15) *De natura rerum*, written at the request of King Sisebut and dedicated to him. In its forty-five chapters it contains the most noteworthy facts concerning the elements, the heavenly bodies, the weather, the divisions of the earth, and the like, the material being drawn in great part from Suetonius, Ambrose, the pseudo-Clementine writings, and Augustine (16) *De numeris liber*, a mystic interpretation of the numbers from one to sixty and their significance in Scripture, nature, and history. The work is important for the history of the symbolism of figures. (17) *Etymologiarum sive originum libri viginti*, the culmination of all the works of its author, his other writings being either preparations or extensions of individual parts of this book. It formed the great encyclopedia of Isidore's period, and derived its name from the etymology prefixed to each article. The work is divided into twenty books treating of the following subjects: i. grammar; ii. rhetoric and dialectics; iii. arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy; iv. medicine; v. jurisprudence and chronology, with a brief universal history; vi. Bible, inspiration, the canon, sacraments, liturgy, Easter, feasts, libraries, manuscripts, books, writing-material, and the like; vii. a compend of theology, God, the Trinity, angels and men, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, clerks, and monks; viii. church and synagogue, religion and faith, heresy and schism, Jewish and Christian heretics, gentile philosophers, poets, sibyls, magicians, and gods; ix. various peoples and languages, offices and forms of government, marriages and relationships; x. Latin lexicon, with an explanation of about 500 words in alphabetical order; xi. mankind; xii. animals; xiii. the composition and motion of the world; xiv. divisions of the earth, lands, and mountains; xv. cities; xvi. earth and stone, gems and metals, weights and measures; xvii. agriculture, plants, and grain; xviii. war, weapons, games; xix. ships, buildings, clothing, adornment; xx. food, drink, furniture, and agricultural implements. Isidore's chief sources were Cassiodorus, Boethius, Varro, Solinus, Pliny, Hyginus, Servius, Lactantius, Tertullian, and especially the *Prata* of Suetonius, but much was written from memory, thus accounting for many of the inaccuracies of the work. The *Etymologiae* remained the great work of reference for hundreds of years, and was practically copied by Rabanus in his encyclopedic *De universo* (844), while it was profoundly admired by John of Salisbury in the twelfth century. Compiler and plagiarist though he may have been, it has been well said that centuries would have remained in darkness if Isidore had not let his light shine.

In addition to the works already enumerated, Isidore is said to have written many smaller treatises, and others still have been ascribed to him, such as the *Quaestiones de Veteri et Novo Testamento* and the *De ordine creaturarum*, *De contemptu mundi*, and an interpretation of the Song of Solomon. A number of Latin poems are ascribed to him, but with little warrant, and hymns to Agatha and other martyrs are included among the Mozarabic hymns. Several of his letters are still extant, and contain much of biographical and contemporary interest.

(R. SCHMID.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Lists of literature are given in C. U. J. Chevalier, *Sources historiques du moyen-âge*, p. 1127, Paris, 1877 sqq.; J. E. B. Mayor, *Bibliographical Clue to Latin Literature*, p. 212, London, 1875; Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 687–689. The best edition of his works is by F. Arevali, 7 vols., Rome, 1797–1803, reproduced in *MPL*, lxxxi.–lxxxiv. Others are by M. de la Bigne, Paris, 1580; J. de Breul and J. Grial, Paris, 1601; by Grial and Gomez, Madrid, 1778. Consult: N. Antonio, *Bibliotheca Hispana vetus*, ed. P. Bayer, Madrid, 1788; J. C. F. Bähr, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, supplement, i. 111–113, Carlsruhe, 1836; C. E. Bourret, *L'École chrétienne de Seville*, pp. 59–193, Paris, 1855; C. F. Montalembert, *Les Moines de l'occident*, ii. 200–218, 5 vols., Paris, 1860–67, Eng. transl., i. 421–424, Boston, 1872; P. Gams, *Kirchengeschichte Spaniens*, ii. 2, pp. 102–113, Regensburg, 1874; H. Hertzberg, *Die Historien und Chroniken des Isidorus von Sevilla*, Göttingen, 1874; Wattenbach, *DGQ*, i (1885), 81–83, i (1893), 84–86; A. Ebert, *Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters*, i. 588–602, Leipsic, 1889; W. Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, ii. 627–630, London, 1890; W. S. Teuffel, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, pp. 1292–1295, Leipsic, 1890; C. Cañal, *San Isidoro*, Seville, 1897; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xi. 710–728.

Neander, *Christian Church*, iii. 151–153 et passim; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iv. 662–669 et passim; *KL*, vi. 969–976; *DCB*, iii. 305–313. The first two volumes of the edition of his works by Arevali gather up the various accounts of the life and add critical comments.

ISIDORIAN DECRETALS. See Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals.

ISIDORUS MERCATOR. See Isidore Mercator.

ISKANDARUNAH. See Phenicia, Phenicians, I. § 2.

ISLAM. See Mohammed, Mohammedanism.

ISRAEL, HISTORY OF.

I. Biblical History.
  Primitive History (§ 1).
  The Abrahamic History (§ 2).
  The Sojourn in Egypt (§ 3).
  The Exodus and the Giving of the Law (§ 4).
  The Conquest of Canaan and the Judges (§ 5).
  The United Kingdom (§ 6).
  The Divided Kingdom (§ 7).
  Judah to the Exile (§ 8).
  The Exile (§ 9).
  The Persian Period (§ 10).
  The Greek Period (§ 11).
  The Maccabean and Roman Periods (§ 12).
II. Post-Biblical History.
  1. General Survey.
  2. The Early Period.
    Conditions after the War; Jabneh (§ 1).
    The Last Insurrections (§ 2).
    Rise of the Babylonian School (§ 3).
    The Two Talmudic Collections; The Masorah (§ 4).
  3. The Middle Period.
    In the Orient and Italy (§ 1).
    In Spain; Rise of Jewish Culture (§ 2).
    Jewish Scholars in Spain (§ 3).
    Temporal Situation in Spain to 1469 (§ 4).
    The Inquisition in Spain (§ 5).
    Jews in France (§ 6).
    In England (§ 7).
    In Italy (§ 8).
    In Germany (§ 9).
    Revival of Messianism (§ 10).
    Jews in Poland (§ 11).
  4. The New Period.
  5. Jews in America.
    Early Settlements (§ 1).
    In the United States, 1800–80 (§ 2).
    Reform, Educational, and Charitable Movements (§ 3).
    The New Immigration Since 1880 (§ 4).
    The Press; General Conditions (§ 5).

1. Primitive History.

I. Biblical History: Primitive history as set forth in Genesis takes the form of the history of families. In Semitic nomadic life the family is the unit from which the tribe is conceived as developing. Consequently the Hebrews regarded the nations of the world as the results of ramifications from a single stock. It is debated how far the history of families as given in Genesis is to be taken as historical, and how far the genealogical scheme depends upon observed ethnographic relationships. In the story of the different stocks, while in general little of personal life appears, the forms of the patriarchs stand out full of individuality, and the attempt is not successful to read the experiences attributed to them in certain situations and in individualistic form as the doings of a tribe or a people. Moreover, the sobriety and exactness of detail in these narratives is such as to differentiate them from the poetizing sagas in which folk-lore celebrates the eponymous ancestors to whom the origins of the peoples are traced. It lies on the face of these narratives that they are only fragments of traditions which had for a long time been transmitted orally, and in the course of this transmission the lesser figures have dropped from the account and only the great personalities have remained. But the memory of such personalities as Abraham (q.v.), the father of the nation with whom is associated the migration from the Euphrates to Canaan, or Jacob (q.v.), who endured hard service in the Aramaic territory and earned the blessing of God as the father of a numerous progeny, or Joseph (q.v.), through whose vicissitudes the settlement in Egypt was brought about, remained a permanent possession essentially constant in form. For the historicity of the person of Abraham it may be said that his history is not discordant with what Assyrian-Babylonian history demands, and the story of Joseph is accordant with what is known of Egyptian history.

2. The Abrahamic History.

In Genesis Abraham is the descendant and spiritual heir of Shem. According to Gen. x. 21 sqq. he shares this descent with a group of nations, all of whom (except Elam and Lud) are related in language and blood to the Hebrews and are still known as Semites. In Gen. xiv. 13 Abraham is called "the Hebrew," and according to the Biblical representation the Israelites were in early times called Hebrews by other peoples, especially by the Egyptians. The connotation of this term Hebrew is narrower than that of Semite, but broader than that of Israelite, though its exact meaning is not established. It can hardly mean "those who dwell beyond the Jordan" (Stade and E. Meyer), but is better brought into relation with the river Euphrates and related to the Assyrian expression "across the river." The equating of the Hebrew form *ʿIbhrim* with the Egyptian *ʿApriu* is questionable; more likely is the equivalency of the Hebrew form with the *Ḥabiri* of the Amarna Tablets, though the signification of *Ḥabiri* must not be restricted to the forefathers of the Hebrews. The existence of the Hebraic nomadic family life in Canaan was arduous, according to the concordant testimony of the sources. The people often had to change their dwelling-places to secure pasturage. Still more difficult was their situation in times of famine, as when they had to transfer themselves to Egypt, at that time the granary of the region, and found themselves subject to oppression and placed under disabilities (Gen. xx. 11). It was a necessity of this kind which brought about the settlement of the entire Jacob clan in Egypt, in the northwestern part known as Goshen, the later "Arab nome district" about Phakusa, the present Saft el-Henneh, a region not yet definitely marked out (E. Naville, *Goshen and the Shrine of Saft el Henneh*, London, 1887). While little is known of the people during their stay there, the circumstances were so favorable that they developed into a nation which yet was not politically organized in national form, but lived under the patriarchal government of tribal sheiks. On the religious side much must have been borrowed from the orderly state in which they were. While a part of the people followed pastoral occupations, another part settled down to agricultural life (Num.

xi. 5), and something of the industrial accomplishment of the Egyptians must have been acquired. That the Israelites showed a greater receptivity and productivity in respect to culture than their near relatives, the Edomites and Moabites, is due in part to their sojourn in Egypt. The pre-Mosaic period was a preparation also for the theocratic and national cult of later times. The preaching of Moses must have had a basis in the knowledge of contemporary Hebrews; and the sources unitedly attribute to the patriarchs acquaintance with the God of the covenant, though he was called by other names. This God of the patriarchs was invisible, exalted, not bound to any one land, though he revealed himself in definite localities which were therefore holy, and was the possessor of heaven and earth (Gen. xiv. 19), dwelling in heaven and ruling the earth. The recollection clung that Abraham had been called from a relationship where idolatry was the rule (Josh. xxiv. 2, 14). The uniqueness of God was not theoretically developed, but was rather a practical monotheism which permitted to the Hebrews worship of him alone. The stone worship and totemism some find in Genesis is discovered only through wilful exegesis and eisegesis. Even in the naive anthropomorphisms of Gen. xi., xviii.–xix. there are evidences of an exalted conception of God. These religious ideas were not derived from Egypt, for they differ entirely from Egyptian conceptions, though that the Hebrews derived some things from the Egyptians is clear from Josh. xxiv. 14; Ezek. xx. 7 sqq., but that the calf worship had such an origin is improbable (see Calf, The Golden).

3. The Sojourn in Egypt.

In the region granted them by the Egyptians, the Hebrew shepherds lived in relative independence and grew strong. Into this situation was injected the circumstance simply expressed in Ex. i. 8 as the rise of a king who knew not Joseph. This is doubtless to be connected with the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt and the antiforeign sentiments of the new dynasty. The half-nomads in the northeast were subjected to the corvée and put to building fortresses and storehouses; and since this did not suffice to reduce their strength, the slaughter of the male children was ordered. Thus what had been a welcome asylum became a place of slavery under the hardships of which the Hebrews groaned. Liberation from this situation is attributed by a unanimous tradition to Moses. The period of the oppression is with growing assurance asserted to be that of Rameses II., whose name is connected with so many building-enterprises and monuments. In that case his son and successor, Meneptah, was the Pharaoh of the Exodus (see Egypt, I., 4, § 3). Apparently against this is an inscription of Meneptah telling of an expedition in which he has destroyed Syria and Israel (the latter for the only time found mentioned on Egyptian monuments). If the reference is to Israel, then Israel must already have been living in Canaan, and the Exodus must have taken place earlier. This agrees better with Hebrew tradition, which (I Kings vi. 1) reckoned 480 years between the Exodus and the building of Solomon's temple, which would place the Exodus c. 1440 B.C., therefore in the time of Amenophis II.; and this agrees again with the statement of Manetho, who records the expulsion of the lepers under a king of this name. One circumstance, indeed, tells against this earlier date, viz., the frequent occurrence in the Pentateuch of the name Rameses (Gen. xlvii. 11; Ex. i. 11, xii. 37; Num. xiii. 3, 5). Further, against the late dating of the Exodus is the fact that the tribal name Asher appears in an inscription of Seti, father of Rameses (c. 1350 B.C.), according to which that tribe must have had its residence in the neighborhood of Lebanon. The supposition that this tribe departed alone from Egypt is improbable.* According to Gen. xv. 13, 16, the sojourn in Egypt was to last 400 years or four generations. The Hebrew of Ex. xii. 40–41 gives 430 years, but the Septuagint reads " which they sojourned in Egypt and the land of Canaan." The indication of the narrative of P is that 215 years were assigned to the Egyptian sojourn and 215 to the period between the settlement and David, which was the understanding of Josephus and of the synagogue. Along with this goes the fact that in the genealogies of Moses and Achan between Korah and Levi are mentioned only two steps, between Judah and Achan only three (Ex. vi. 20; Num. xxvi. 59, xvi. 1; Josh. vii. 1). But since in Gen. xv. even the Septuagint has the higher number, its reading in Ex. xii. 40 appears to be an emendation. With the longer period would agree the censuses of Num. i., xxvi., which involve a population of about 2,000,000 souls, and Num. xi. 21. On the other hand, it is difficult to reconcile these high numbers with the long sojourn in the peninsula of Sinai [or to find room for so many people in the region. Therefore these numbers are now rejected, and scholars reduce the number of Israelites in the Exodus to a few thousands].

4. The Exodus and the Giving of the Law.

The Exodus under Moses was regarded by the Israelites as the birth of the nation (for the route of the Exodus see Red Sea; Wandering in the Wilderness). The historicity of the narrative of the Exodus would suffer no harm if it were assumed that only the noblest part of the people, to which the Joseph tribes belonged, took part in the event, while the other tribes were already in the peninsula; but for this supposition there is no sure ground. To Moses, under direction of God, were due both the Exodus and the covenant between Yahweh and Israel; but they were essentially divine acts, and God became known by his name Yahweh (see Jehovah; and Yahweh). The result was the cult and the conceptions of life which became regnant in Israel. The resulting form of government has, since the time of Josephus (*Apion*, ii. 16), been called a theocracy, the idea being that to God was assigned the authority for all rights and acts. Hence the law included not only regulations for civil and criminal processes, but also regulations governing sacrifices and festivals and purifications. From the time of the reception of the law the solidarity of the people was an accomplished fact, while at the same time the personality of deity was emphasized. The people had become a united religious community. It is self-evident, therefore, that Moses set in order the cultus for this community, sanctioning or prohibiting customs then prevalent, those which were accepted then receiving new consecration. He appointed also a central sanctuary, without an image,—the ark of the covenant with the celebrations centering about it, and in this centralization lay the only protection for the pure worship of Yahweh. The priests at the central sanctuary of later times were naturally the protectors of the Mosaic law, and while this law necessarily received modifications in the course of time, in general no law was known which did not go by the name of Moses. That there were relapses from observance of this law is not surprising. Equally sure is it that the law is not merely ideally referred to the desert period of Israel's life, but that it grew out of the leader's struggle with the people, whose rebellious and distrustful character so often manifested itself in the desert. The continuance of the desert sojourn is given as forty years by the concordant tradition and Amos v. 25. This period includes several smaller periods when the people settled about some spot, as at the mountain and at Kadesh. With this period of forty years agrees the fact that it was a new generation which undertook the conquest, different from that which had participated in the crossing of the Red Sea.

---

* The text takes no account of the explanation by recent critics of the Seti and Meneptah inscriptions. This is to the effect that the Hebrew tribes whose descent was traced to concubines of Jacob were those who, already settled in Canaan in prehistoric times, were absorbed at a comparatively late period, to which fact is due the less honorable account of their origin. The tribes mentioned in the inscriptions were in that case not among the refugees in Egypt or the Hebrews of the Exodus, but had maintained their residence in Canaan, where they were assailed by Seti and Meneptah. This is supported by the legend of the substitution of the name Israel for Jacob, which is the eponymous method of accounting for a transfer of name from a portion to the whole people. G. W. G.

5. The Conquest of Canaan and the Judges.

Moses was not among those who entered the promised land; only the East-Jordanland, not included in the promises, did he see in possession of the people. But to Joshua was divinely committed the task of leading the people across the Jordan. Campaigns were accomplished in the north, then in the central portion at Shiloh the central sanctuary was established. Before his death Joshua called an assembly of the people at Shechem and there exhorted them to remain true to their God. For the relation of the narrative in the Book of Joshua to Judges i., see JOSHUA, BOOK OF. When the land was parceled out among the tribes, when the Hebrews came to mingle with the earlier inhabitants and were no longer held together by a central authority, it could hardly be otherwise than that the political solidarity should be lost, that the tribal distinctions should emerge, and that the tribes should enter into various relationships with the Canaanites. So, too, the religious unity was endangered through communications with the early settlers, while totally different conceptions of deity overlaid those which had been received at Sinai. It was easy to adopt into the Yahweh worship customs which in origin and meaning were heathen. This happened particularly at the high places, the sanctuaries of the Canaanites, which were adopted as places of sacrifice by the Hebrews (see HIGH PLACES). With this went relapse into the worship of the Baals and Astartes, with their impure cults so opposed to that of Yahweh. The obliteration of the religious distinction between Hebrews and Canaanites carried with it more or less of social and political dependence or amalgamation, especially where the Hebrews were in the minority. To this was perhaps due the loss of physical courage through which subjection to the inroads of the hordes of Midianites, Amalekites, Moabites, Ammonites, and Philistines was brought about, relief from which was wrought by the inspired heroes who aroused the people to resistance. These heroes —the Judges—were, above all, champions of freedom, but their strength and success lay in the fact that they recalled the people to trust and obedience given to the God of Moses and Joshua (see JUDGES). This is true of such of the Judges as Deborah, Gideon, Jephthah (qq.v.), while of Samson (q.v.) it must be said that his significance was rather individual than national or tribal, and of others, such as Elon and Abdon, the influence was rather tribal or local than national. The result of this period was severance into tribal groups and loss of the sense of nationality.

6. The United Kingdom.

This severance, due to the breaking of the covenant bond founded upon the relationship with Yahweh, naturally led in turn to the demand for a firmer political union under a national head in whom leadership was more externally evident than under a pure theocracy. The tendency toward a monarchical form of government was manifested under Gideon, whose son, Abimelech, exercised a brief sway over a limited region. The founding of the kingdom is, however, inseparably connected with the name of Samuel (q.v.), the last of the Judges, who exercised also the functions of priest and prophet. The immediate occasion of the establishment of the kingdom was the oppression by the Philistines. The hope of relief from this distress was realized under Saul (q.v.), who, however, soon regarded himself as sovereign and not as the representative of the sole king, Yahweh. This led to the announcement of his rejection through Samuel, followed quickly by his melancholia and his defeat and death at Gilboa. Before his death his successor had been chosen in the person of David (q.v.), son of Jesse, of Bethlehem of Judah, who had achieved prominence as a leader in war and had aroused Saul's jealousy, hatred, and persecution. After the death of Saul, David was for seven and a half years king in Hebron over Judah, while Ishbosheth (q.v.) reigned in Mahanaim across the Jordan over the northern tribes. After the violent death of Ishbosheth David became king over the united tribes, and fixed his residence finally in Jerusalem, then newly captured. His leadership in war and peace brought the kingdom to its highest point of prosperity. His spiritual and religious significance was also great, characterized as it was by complete concord between king and prophet; and no less marked was his influence upon the cultus through his placing of the ark in the capital, through his service to the ritual of song, as well as his zealous devotion to Yahweh. His son and successor, Solomon (q.v.), built in Jerusalem the temple, which became more and more the cultic center for the entire land, in spite of its temporary destruction. His reign, unlike that of his father's, was one of peace; yet the very fact that the land was unassailed by external foes, together with the jealousy of the northern tribes at being ruled by a Judahite, prepared the way for the division of the kingdom, which was supported by the prophetic leaders, swayed in part by Solomon's acquiescence in the practise of heathen rites introduced by the princesses whom he had made his wives.

7. The Divided Kingdom.

After the death of Solomon the larger part of the nation revolted from the Davidic dynasty and set up the Ephraimite Jeroboam (q.v.) as king, while to Rehoboam (q.v.), Solomon's son, only the southern part remained true with the capital, to which adhered Judah, part of Benjamin, remains of Simeon, and Dan, and most of the Levites. A hostility began between the two kingdoms which resulted in mutual weakening and in consequent inability to resist external powers such as Syria and Assyria. The division was also religiously disastrous. In order to wean the people from Jerusalem and its sanctuary, Jeroboam set up golden calves (see Calf, the Golden) as images of Yahweh at Dan and Bethel and in this way reintroduced the principle of religious syncretism into the worship of Yahweh. Nevertheless the prophets remained a powerful agency in the Ephraimitic kingdom. Politically the situation there was lamentable. Dynasty succeeded dynasty in rapid succession, and the revolutionary principle was often in evidence in the further history. The dynasty of Jeroboam (q.v.) had but two generations, as had that of the next founded by the usurper Baasha (q.v.); Zimri (q.v.) reigned but seven days, and was overthrown by Omri (q.v.), whose name became so celebrated that in the Assyrian inscriptions Israel was long known as the "land of Omri." Omri made Samaria (q.v.) the permanent capital, and was succeeded by his son, Ahab (q.v.), a king successful in his external relations, but swayed at home by his consort, Jezebel (q.v.), whose unremitting efforts to subvert the Yahweh cult for that of Baal were opposed by Elijah (q.v.). The reigns of Ahab's sons, Ahaziah and Joram (qq.v.), brought the dynasty to an end. The period of the Omri dynasty was one of peace and alliance between the two kingdoms, cemented by marriage between the two houses in the persons of Athaliah, daughter of Jezebel, and Ahab and Joram (q.v.) of Judah. In the meantime the southern kingdom under Rehoboam had suffered severely under a campaign of Shishak of Egypt, but under his grandson, Asa (q.v.), and his great-grandson, Jehoshaphat (q.v.), its prestige was recovered. The alliance between the two houses almost resulted in the extinction of the Davidic dynasty through the massacre by Athaliah, from which only Joash (q.v.) of the seed royal escaped. Under Joram, father of Joash, Edom, the one vassal people remaining to Judah from the united kingdom, had secured its independence. In the northern kingdom judgment came upon the dynasty of Omri through Jehu (q.v.), who, with frightful slaughter, established a new dynasty in Samaria. Jehu and his son and successor, Jehoahaz (q.v.), were, however, vassals of the Syrians. Under Jehu's grandson, Joash (q.v.), this vassalage was broken and Judah was reduced to a tributary position under Amaziah (q.v.), son of Joash of Judah. Jeroboam II. (q.v.), the fourth of Jehu's dynasty, raised the kingdom to an unexampled height of prosperity, quickly lost under his successor, Zachariah (q.v.). Jeroboam reestablished the early bounds of the kingdom by bringing the Moabites and part of the Syrian territory under Israelitic dominion. This was the period of the prophets Amos, Hosea, and Jonah the son of Amittai (qq.v.), who showed the contrast between the apparent prosperity and the internal decay of the kingdom. The Assyrians had been battering at Syria and had already come into close relations with Israel. Ahab had fought against Assyria at Karkar, Jehu had paid costly tribute in 842 B.C.; but Tiglath-Pileser III. (see Assyria, VI., 3, § 9) had subjected to his power the country up to the Mediterranean coast; Jehu's dynasty ended with Zachariah, who was slain by Shallum, and he in turn was killed by Menahem (q.v.) after a reign of one month. Menahem reigned five years, a vassal of Tiglath-Pileser; his son Pekahiah (q.v.) was slain by the usurper Pekah (q.v.), whose combination with Syria against Judah was aimed against Assyria, and led to the final catastrophe under his successor, Hoshea (q.v.). In Judah the calamity sustained under Amaziah was gradually forgotten during the long reign of Uzziah (q.v.), whose generalship secured the subjection of the Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites, while the northern kingdom declined. Whether the Azriyahu of Yaudi ("Judah") mentioned in the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser as at the head of an anti-Assyrian combination is to be identified with this king or with the king of a North-Syrian Yaudi is still debated. Uzziah directed well the inner fortunes of the state, patronizing agriculture and grazing. The Chronicler ascribes his leprosy to an invasion of priestly rights; in consequence of this disease his son Jotham (q.v.) ruled long as regent before he succeeded to the throne. In the time of Jotham's successor, Ahaz (q.v.), occurred the alliance of Israel and Syria against Judah, referred to above; and the situation was complicated by a hostile combination of Edomites and Philistines. But Ahaz was relieved by the successes of Tiglath-Pileser, whose campaigns were directed against Judah's foes. The Assyrian beset Samaria, which Sargon finally took, carrying 27,000 of its inhabitants into captivity, leaving Judah to survive for 135 years.

8. Judah to the Exile.

The successor of Ahaz to the throne of Judah was Hezekiah (q.v.), a vassal of Assyria, but most restless in that relation, who was saved from the vengeance of Sennacherib in a way regarded as miraculous. His son, Manasseh (q.v.), was strongly disposed toward heathenism, persecuting the adherents of the Yahweh religion. This policy was continued under his son Ammon (q.v.), but reversed under his second successor, Josiah (q.v.), who, with all earnestness, reintroduced the Mosaic faith and cultus. Josiah's untimely death, caused by his confronting the Egyptian Necho at Megiddo, was a most serious blow to the welfare of Judah. His son Jehoahaz (q.v.) was removed from the throne by Necho after the latter's return from the East three months later, and Jehoiakim, his elder brother, was put in his place. Jehoiakim (q.v.) became tributary to the Babylonians, but revolted after three years, an offense which was expiated after his death by his son, Jehoiachin (q.v.), whom, after a reign of three months, Nebuchadrezzar took prisoner and carried to Babylon with the noblest of the land. The Babylonians placed upon the throne a third son of Josiah, who assumed the name Zedekiah (q.v.); he, in the ninth year of his reign, conspired in alliance with the Pharaoh Hophra to throw off the Babylonian yoke, in this going counter to the advice of Jeremiah and Ezekiel and thereby challenging the might of the Euphrates kingdom. The Babylonians invested Jerusalem after defeating a force of Egyptians sent to break the siege, captured the city in 586 B.C., destroyed the temple and the city's defenses, visited with punishment the leaders of the people, and carried away into captivity all whose social rank exposed them to possibilities of leadership. Gedaliah (q.v.) was made governor and took up his residence in Mizpah, where the remnant of the people gathered about him, and where he soon became the victim of assassination. Many of the remaining people fled into Egypt, taking with them against his will the prophet Jeremiah. Jerusalem lay in ruins, large parts of the territory of Judea passed into the possession of the Edomites, and the future and promise of Israel for the next fifty years was in the exiles in Babylon.

9. The Exile.

The exiles were settled in Babylonia along the Chebar in the neighborhood of Nippur (see BABYLONIA, IV., § 9), where they possessed their own houses and lands and a certain degree of autonomy. The only basis for a history of the exilic period and the life of that time is in the books of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah, which last originated in the last third of the exile. Part of the people relapsed into idolatry. But for the rest, in their enforced abstinence from participation in the religious ordinances of the sanctuary, the spiritual significance of such observances as the Sabbath rest, and the ordinances regarding food and circumcision became deepened as being signs of their distinction as the people of God. The very nearness of heathenism repelled many of the Jews, as there was borne in upon them the fact that their own experiences were the expression of a long-deferred judgment for this sin. There was also impressed upon the nation the idea of its mission in the world as a mediator between God and the nations.

10. The Persian Period.

About fifty years after the destruction of Jerusalem the Babylonian empire came into the hands of Cyrus. Babylon was taken in 539, and in that year the Jews received from the victor permission to return. Of this permission 42,360 males, with their families, availed themselves under the leadership of Sheshbazzar-Zerubbabel (the identity of Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel is still debated) and the high priest Joshua, and reached Jerusalem probably in 538. They settled in Jerusalem and in the outlying cities, set up the altar of burnt offerings, and made preparations to rebuild the temple. Owing, however, to the opposition of the Samaritans, who placed all difficulties in the way, and to the necessity of securing means of subsistence, the reconstruction of the temple was deferred till the beginning of the reign of Darius, in the years 520–516 B.C., and was accomplished then under the stimulus of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah. The report of the return in 538 has been seriously questioned, and the thesis advanced that Zerubbabel was never in exile, and that the temple was rebuilt by the Jews who had remained in Palestine; but these hypotheses are based on arbitrary constructions which fall on examination. For the period 516–458 no reports have been transmitted, except that the narrative of the Book of Esther (q.v.) refers to the time of Xerxes. In 458 B.C. under Artaxerxes I. the condition of the colony at Jerusalem was miserable and the maintenance of its religious distinction endangered. Then the scribe Ezra (q.v.) led back to Judea a new company of exiles consisting of 1,500 males with their families. He was empowered by royal firman to put into practise the requirements of the Mosaic law, but entire success in this direction was attained only when, in 445–444 B.C., Nehemiah (q.v.) came to his support, clothed with the authority of the governorship. Nehemiah reestablished the defenses of Jerusalem by having the walls of the city repaired, notwithstanding the opposition of the Samaritans, and then assisted Ezra in the purification of the community by causing the dismission of the heathen wives and requiring the observance of the entire Mosaic law. After a residence of twelve years Nehemiah returned to the Persian court, but in a later visit to Jerusalem found it necessary to employ stern measures for the preservation of the Mosaic institutions, expelling from the community a grandson of the high priest who had married a daughter of the Samaritan noble Sanballat (q.v.). According to Josephus (*Ant.* XI., viii. 2 sqq.), this priest, with the help of his father-in-law, established the sanctuary of the Samaritans on Mount Gerizim and set in order its priesthood; but Josephus confused these events with others which occurred in the time of Alexander the Great. Undoubtedly at that time the Samaritans received from the Jews the Pentateuch, which constitutes their Scriptures. Of the last ten years of the Persian period no trustworthy reports have come down. There are statements that Artaxerxes III. Ochus ordered a deportation of Jews to Hyrcania, on the south shore of the Caspian, because they were involved in a rebellion of Phenicians and Cypriotes against the Persians. On this occasion the Persian General Bagoses pushed into the temple, and Josephus reports (*Ant.* XI., vii. 1) that he substituted Jesus (Joshua) as high priest for his brother John. The political importance of the high priest originated in that period.

With the destruction of the Persian empire by Alexander the Great a new period began for Judea.

11. The Greek Period.

Alexander's attitude toward the Jews was friendly. But when, after the conqueror's death, his empire was divided, Judea, lying between the kingdoms of the contending Ptolemies and the Seleucidae, was a continual sufferer by the conflict. At first Judea came into the power of the Ptolemies. Josephus reports that Ptolemy Lagus violated the Sabbath, captured Jerusalem, and carried captive to Egypt a large number of Jews from Jerusalem and Galilee (*Apion*, i. 22; *Ant.* XII., i., XIII., xii. 4). Hecataeus says that later this Ptolemy was so friendly toward the Jews that many of them of their own accord went to Egypt and settled there, particularly in Alexandria. Judea still remained the object of strife between Syria and Egypt, and came finally into the power of Syria under Antiochus III. the Great, by his victory over Scopus near Paneas. Of Seleucus Philopator, son of Antiochus the Great, it is reported that his general, Heliodorus, entered the temple to plunder it and was prevented by a miraculous vision. The succession of Antiochus IV. Epiphanes to the throne of Syria (175 B.C.) was of especial moment to the Jews. During the changes which had befallen the political possession of Palestine, Jewish independence being entirely lost, the chief concern of the Jews was their religious freedom. But contact with Greek civilization and the attempts of the leaders to make capital out of the quarrels of the overlords, as well as the building up in the land of centers of Greek life through settlement there of Greek colonies, introduced the spirit of Hellenism and caused the establishment of a party among the Jews favorable to Greek civilization, receiving therefore the support of the overlords. Opposed to this Hellenistic party was the party of the Hasideans, committed to the observance of the Mosaic ordinances, and to the condemnation of Hellenism. Into the contest between these two parties Antiochus Epiphanes intruded by his brutal attack on the sanctuary, 168 B.C., as well as by his assault upon the religious observances of the Jews and his edict against the Sabbath and circumcision. His anger on account of the failure of his expedition against Egypt he vented in this way upon the Jews, and he thus became the antetype of the New-Testament Antichrist. Severe persecution followed, in the course of which many Jews abandoned their religion.

12. The Maccabean and Roman Periods.

A turn in affairs was given in the year 167 B.C. in the resistance offered by the priest Mattathias of Modein, supported by his sons. Rebellion against Syria broke out, led by Judas, son of Mattathias, who won many victories over Syrian troops, restored the service of the temple, and died a hero's death. The strife was carried on by the brothers of Judas, one of whom, Simon, gained the position of high priest and prince by choice of the people and recognition by the Syrians. Until the time of Simon's son, John Hyrcanus, the Maccabees and the Hasideans were of the same party and, indeed, bore the same name (see HASMONEANS). They were the predecessors of the Pharisees (see PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES). John broke with the orthodox party and connected himself with the Sadducees. After his death his family became involved in quarrels over the succession and lost its preeminent position, and against his son Alexander Jannaeus (104–78 B.C.) the Pharisees sought Syrian help. In the strife that ensued upon his death, caused by attempts to gain the succession, the Romans obtained entrance, and Pompey captured Jerusalem after a three months' siege. Herod, son of the Idumean Antipater, was made king by the Roman senate in 39 B.C., and established himself by the help of the Roman legions in 37 B.C. He sought to conciliate the Jews, particularly by his magnificent restoration of the temple. After the death of this talented but conscienceless tyrant, his kingdom was divided between his sons Archelaus, Antipas, and Philip. The first, to whom Judea had fallen, was soon deposed by the Romans (6 A.D.), and government by Roman procurators was instituted with capital at Caesarea. The procurators appointed by the Romans had no appreciation of Jewish characteristics, and constant ill-feeling was aroused over religious matters. The best known of these officers is Pontius Pilate (26–36 A.D.), whose conduct caused many conflicts with the people and whose unstable character is revealed in the story of the trial of Jesus (see PILATE, PONTIUS). The opposition between the suppressed theocratic consciousness of the Jews and the claims of the Caesars grew ever sharper until the final conflict. Open rupture was almost provoked in the year 40 A.D. by the order of Caligula to have his image set up in the temple, a crisis that was passed only by the intercession of Agrippa I. at Rome. To this end Agrippa was given the realm which had been Herod's, and his favor to the Jews appears in his attitude toward the Christians (see HEROD AND HIS FAMILY). The situation of the Jews became more difficult under Felix and Festus, still harder under Albinus, and the rebellion came to a head under Gessius Florus. The Zealots seized the temple and fortified themselves there; Agrippa II., who had succeeded to a lesser area of sovereignty than Agrippa I. controlled, did not suppress the insurrection. In a battle near Beth-horon a Roman force was nearly annihilated. This victory inflamed the whole country. But the Romans began to press in, and under Vespasian they conquered Peraea in 68 A.D., while internal strife divided the Jews between the Zealots and the moderates. In the year 70, a few days before the Passover, Titus appeared before the walls of Jerusalem and assailed it from the north. In fourteen days the outer wall was taken, and, a few days after, the second, while the innermost and strongest afforded means of greater resistance. Famine seized the defenders, but in spite both of the mild proposals of Titus for the surrender of the city and his stern exhibitions of punishment that must ensue, the defense was maintained. The people still hoped for such deliverance from God as their history recorded as having occurred in earlier times. The temple was the last stronghold. When it was taken, Titus would have preserved it at the request of Josephus, but his intention was frustrated by the unguarded act of a soldier who applied the torch. After the fall of Jerusalem, resistance was still offered at a few fortresses, such as Herodeum near Tekoa, Machaerus across the Jordan, and Masada, west of the Dead Sea. But from that time the Jews have had to live without country, sanctuary, and nationality.

C. von Orelli.

II. Post-Biblical History.—1. General Survey: With the fall of Jerusalem the Jewish nation lost the remains of its independence and all control over its external destiny, while it became dependent upon the peoples among whom it lived. It nevertheless had received such a development of spiritual, social, and religious life as had differentiated it from the other nations with which its lot was from that time cast and had made absorption into them an impossibility. Consequently the Jewish people has had for 1,900 years its own inner history, which has not been without influence upon the world at large. Externally and internally this history divides into three periods: (1) From the fall of Jerusalem to the Mohammedan conquest and the emergence of the Teutons; (2) to the French Revolution; (3) to the present. In the first of these periods the Jews built about themselves a spiritual wall within which they protected and developed their peculiar and individual bent. Abandoning all claims upon the outer world, they busied themselves with the production of the Talmud, the citadel of their spiritual life, the treasury of their thought, the basis of the physical and spiritual laws of their existence. When their individuality had thus been fixed in enduring form, they could without danger to their peculiar genius participate in the life of the nations of the world so far as this was permitted to them. In the second period this participation was very limited, confined chiefly to the exercise of the functions of commerce and of the privileges of middlemen between the Orient and Occident. They also exercised a decided influence upon culture and mediated between Greek learning and philosophy and the Arabic and between the Arabs and the West, and so contributed to learning of the scholastic type, producing a monistic type of thought best illustrated by Spinoza. With the French Revolution began the gradual emancipation of the Jews, in which they gained political equality with Christians, lost the quality of separativeness, acquired eminence in the world of wealth and of letters, but at the expense of that intensity of religious life which had distinguished them through the centuries. Against this there came late in the nineteenth century a reaction which took the form of Zionism (q.v.), one of the purposes of which is the unification of the nation through the erection of a Jewish state in Palestine. The present century finds among the Jews a social excitement and a spiritual ferment such as it has not known since the destruction of Jerusalem.

1. Conditions after the War; Jabneh.

2. The Early Period: The Jewish war left Judea a waste and its Jewish inhabitants despoiled. Vespasian took the land as his personal domain, from which he bestowed estates upon his friends; he settled 800 veterans in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, and compelled those Jews who wished to remain in the country to purchase their holdings from the conqueror. The Jews who had previously been domiciled in other lands became the real strength of those nations. They were in greatest force in Egypt, especially in Alexandria; but they were scattered elsewhere from India westward, and no considerable city was without its Jewish community and its synagogue. In Rome there were at least 8,000 Jews with their own quarter of the city; Jewish merchants followed the legions, while the Herodian family had a recognized place at court, and Jews under the empire had special exemption and position. With the destruction of Jerusalem the Jews had lost their unifying center. But by his flight to the camp of the Romans and his prediction to Vespasian of elevation to the throne, Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai (cf. *JE*, vii. 214 sqq.) had gained the emperor's favor and a promise to grant any request the rabbi might make. The latter asked permission to establish a school of Jewish law, and when this was given, settled at Jabneh or Jamnia, a little city near the coast south of Joppa. Under the care of the institution there erected came the settlement of many matters formerly in charge of the Sanhedrin, including the Jewish calendar. Hence arose the tradition that Rabbi Johanan transferred the Sanhedrin to Jabneh. While it had not been his purpose to create a new center of Judaism, the gathering of scholars there and the study of the law had this effect, and so made possible the continued survival of the Jewish spirit. Jews from abroad sent their sons for the study of the law, while the teachers gave their pronouncement upon matters of importance for all their coreligionists. Here was developed the tradition of the law, as divided into Halacha and Haggada (see Midrash), out of which came a definite and characteristic set of views which stamps the Jewish learning with what may be called a Talmudic type as opposed to the Biblical type of post-exilic and pre-Christian Judaism. This is the third stage in the development of the Jewish spirit, the first being what may be termed the pre-Biblical. In this stage the four generations to the close of the Mishna are known as Tanaim, the five to the close of the Talmud as Amoraim, both classes influential upon all succeeding Judaism, guarding as they did Judaic orthodoxy. Among the Tanaim two men were of eminent importance, Gamaliel the younger (cf. *JE*, v. 560 sqq.), and Akiba (q.v.). The first stood for the influence of Hillel's interpretation of the law, for the decision of legal matters by a majority of authorities, and for Jabneh as the continued center of official Judaism. Rabbi Akiba's fame rests not merely upon his collection of the Halachoth, but upon his new method of using the literal and minute elements of Scripture as a basis of legal formulas. Under Gamaliel the estrangement between Jews and Christians became final and complete.

2. The Last Insurrections.

Judaism meanwhile gained ever a stronger influence, and proselytes of eminence in the heathen world adopted the Jewish religion. This aroused Domitian's distrust, and he had the Jewish law examined to discover whether it were a danger to the state. Under Trajan this distrust became greater because of the practical aid given by Jews to the Parthians, and victory over these was recognized, even in inscriptions on coins, as a new victory over the Jews. But the victory over the Jews of the Orient was fearfully avenged upon both Romans and Greeks in a rising of the Jews of the Occident. The imperial legions were exterminated, and in Cyprus alone 240,000 Greeks were said to have been slaughtered. Trajan called in the aid of his best generals to suppress the insurrection, and severe vengeance was taken on the Jews of Mediterranean lands, while the beautiful synagogue in Alexandria was completely destroyed. But in Syria and Asia Minor a new revolt was raised, and the fanaticism of the Jewish spirit, fanned by the Messianic hope centered in Bar Kokba, made necessary the sending of Trajan's most capable general, Julius Severus, from Britain to Palestine. This was the last important attempt of the Jews to establish a Messianic kingdom by force of arms; thenceforth they looked for it to come only by special divine interposition. The site of Jerusalem was given to the plow, and in 134 a Roman colony, Aelia Capitolina, was founded to the north of the old city. Another revolt among the Jews was suppressed in 135. A poll tax was levied, and circumcision and observance of the Sabbath were forbidden. By these means the possibilities of political danger from the Jews were so thoroughly eliminated by the time of Antoninus Pius that he abolished the severe restrictions, and their renewal under Marcus Aurelius was caused not by political conditions, but by religious intolerance. The Jews themselves recognized that their political importance was a thing of the past and that all which remained was their community in matters of religion.

3. Rise of the Babylonian School.

At the end of the second century the Sanhedrin lost its eminence, and the decisions of Rabbi Juda ben Simon were recognized as authoritative. He established as finally decisive the Mishna of Rabbi Akiba, while other collections were pronounced devoid of authority. At this time, it is probable, the Mishna ceased to be oral and was committed to writing. Since all national, political, and judicial rights had ceased, the law had in part only an ideal value as fashioning the inner life and conceptions of Jews. With the compilation of the Mishna Palestinian Judaism had exhausted itself, and the scholastic center shifted to Babylon in the production of the Gemara or the Talmud proper by the school of the Amoraim. What the Mishna is to the Bible the Gemara is to the Mishna—a continuous refinement of the law, binding Judaism within ever tightening chains. The first Amoraim were Palestinians, the most eminent among them Rabbi Juda the younger. He transferred the seat of the school to Tiberias, where, under the favor of Alexander Severus, something of splendor appeared. Relations between Jews and Romans became not merely friendly, but intimate, and laxity in following Judaic practises was the natural result. During this period Babylon was coming into greater significance for the Jews, and was even called "the land of Israel." The head of the Babylonian Jews was an officer under the Parthian government, fourth in rank after the king, and a descendant of the Davidic line. His power, however, was temporal, not as yet spiritual. Rabbi Abba Rab brought the Mishna from Palestine and founded a school at Babylon which soon had 1,200 students. His friend Mar Samuel first enunciated the maxim which became authoritative for Jews—"the law of the state is valid." During the reign of Alexander Severus the neo-Persian kingdom of the Sassanides was established, and this, in its zeal for Zoroastrianism, excluded Jews from office and introduced certain restrictions to be followed on Zoroastrian festivals. These restrictions did not continue long, and until Constantine's time the Jews had peace. Constantine's edict of toleration (312 A.D.) included the Jews also, but later his policy changed and proselyting was forbidden as well as the circumcision of slaves of Jews. In this Jews saw the approach of Messianic times, for it had long been said that "the Messiah will not come till the Roman empire is Christian." But Rabbi Hillel the younger declared that Israel had no Messiah to look forward to, for the prediction by the prophet of a mighty ruler had been fulfilled in Hezekiah; the head of the Babylonian school replied in the prayer "May God forgive Rabbi Hillel for holding this error." Under Constantius matters were still worse for the Jews, and many in the Roman empire emigrated to Persia. Constantine's laws were enforced with the addition that marriage between Jews and Christians was forbidden. Julian especially favored the Jews, and preparations were made for rebuilding the temple, which ceased, however, on his death.

4. The Two Talmudic Collections: the Massorah.

About the year 400 A.D. Rabbi Aschi had the oral explanations, discussions, decisions and investigations based on the Mishna collected in the Babylonian Talmud, which became the chief source of spiritual instruction, as much superior to the Mishna in the regard of scholastic Judaism as the Mishna was to the Bible. Even till the present the Talmud has been for millions of Jews the totality of truth, wisdom, righteousness and holiness, and study of it the certain way to eternal life, while to study anything else is to a real Jew a sign of godlessness. To a Jew instructed in the Talmud God and his revelation as set forth therein are the first and highest interests of life, thought, feeling and action. Thus this collection became the wall which hedged about all Jewish life, the influence which controlled all Jewish thought and molded Jewish conceptions for fifteen hundred years. It was the obstacle, as well, to further development of Jewish religion and life (see TALMUD). This great production came forth in the time when Rome was hard pressed by the Germanic peoples and North Africa became the booty of the Vandals. The mighty world-movements of the times served to arouse once more the Messianic hopes of the Jews, expressed in the saying that the Messiah would not come till the eighty-fifth Jubilee (4200 *anno mundi*, 440 A.D.), about the time when the Vandals captured the temple treasures at Rome and carried them to Africa. As at this time the old sacred treasures of the Jews disappeared, the more precious became the Talmud as the one sacred instrument remaining. So in Palestine the Amoraim collected their traditions in the Jerusalem Talmud, though it is not known where or by whom this was done. In the declining Roman empire the situation of the Jews was not favorable. Theodosius sought to protect them, though foiled by the opposition of Ambrose, and his successors also tried to secure their peace. Under Theodosius II., Cyril of Alexandria had the Jews expelled from the city and their possessions given to the rabble, while their synagogue in Antioch was sacked. Enmity between Jews and Christians became acute. Jerome's Hebrew teacher could attend his pupil only in secret. Palestinian Judaism meanwhile did not perish without leaving one more monument of exceeding value in the Massorah—i.e., the addition of vowels, accents, and marks of division or distinction to the consonantal text of the Old Testament, with annotations on the text. In 470 there began an official persecution of the Jews of Persia, and many were compelled to emigrate to India. Later, in Malabar they received privileges which are chronicled on a tablet still extant, inscribed in Hebrew and early Indian. The end of the period of the Amoraim fell at the close of the fifth century.

1. In the Orient and Italy.

3. The Middle Period: For the Jews of the Byzantine empire this period began with the reign of Justinian, whose laws were the basis of the treatment of the Jews during the Middle Ages. Under his code Jewish testimony against a Christian was not received, a Christian might not become a proselyte to Judaism, Jews had to support highly paid city officials from whom they received no benefits or immunities, they might not celebrate their Passover before the Christian Easter, might read the Scriptures in the synagogue on the Sabbath only in Greek or Latin, while they were subjected at the hands of the rabble to frequent riots with all attendant evils. On the other hand, the Jews lost no opportunity for vengeance, which in turn excited new animosity. At this time the Jews of the Orient dropped out of history and those of the Occident became prominent, especially those of Spain. In Italy, under the great movements of the Germanic peoples, Jews suffered as did the Christians. During the Gothic rule the laws of Theodosius were in force; Jews controlled the slave-trade and held Christians in slavery, and were largely autonomous besides disregarding the laws designed to protect Christians. Still, the highest authorities did all possible to protect the Jews, and the efforts of the popes to this end were constant. Gregory the Great was especially kind to them, compelling indemnification for destroyed synagogues, but he forbade the holding of Christians as slaves, and wrote to several of the kings of his day to make an end of the trade in Christian slaves carried on by the Jews.

2. In Spain; Rise of Jewish Culture.

Of all the countries of Europe none was so favorable to the Jews as Spain. There the highest products of Jewish industry, intellect and skill were in evidence; in wealth, honor, philosophy and poetry the days of the Jews in Spain still mark for them an epoch. On the other hand, in the reaction nowhere was the suffering so great as there. Jewish settlements in the Spanish peninsula were very ancient, made perhaps under the Phenicians; certainly after the destruction of Jerusalem great numbers of Jews were sold into Spain, and Granada was so largely settled by them as to be called a Jewish state. Christianity also made early and great conquests there, and laws similar to those mentioned above were enacted to prevent holding of Christian slaves by Jews and proselyting by force. Later King Sisebut ordered all Jews to receive baptism or to give up their holdings of land, and many Jews complied, while many others migrated to France or Africa. The Jewish question came under discussion at the Synod of Toledo (633 A.D.). Isidore of Seville opposed forcible conversion of the Jews, but forbade that Christians should become Jews and prohibited intercourse between Jews and Christians. The situation changed from time to time. Under one king the Jews would enjoy religious liberty, and Jews who had nominally accepted Christianity were permitted to return to their old faith; under another the menace to the Church of so large a population of Jews was felt, and severe laws against them were put in force. Under King Egica a conspiracy of Spanish and African Jews with the Arabs to overthrow the Gothic kingdom was discovered, but too late; Jews and Arabs made common cause, and the Mohammedan conqueror, Tarik, brought the Gothic kingdom of Spain to an end in 711 A.D. The relations between Jews and Mohammedans was peculiar. Jews regarded Islam as a younger daughter of Judaism, as was Christianity, but they felt more closely related to Islam and never made common cause with Christians against Mohammedans. In Arabia they had made ineffective Constantine's efforts for the spread of Christianity. They had many important settlements there which were governed by Jewish princes, and they had a school of the law and possessed Talmudic learning. When Mohammed proclaimed his faith as that of Abraham, the Jews had faith in him and he called them "helpers." But differences arose, and Mohammed published parts of Suras against them in which he called them murderers of prophets and falsifiers of revelation. Then there came war with the Jewish tribe of the Banu-Kainuka, and one of the two Jewish women whom the prophet brought back tried to poison him. After his death the strife between Mohammedans and Jews continued. In Spain the Jews opened the gates of Toledo to Tarik and took bloody vengeance upon the Christians, while they received many favors from the conquerors. In this period occurred the founding of the sect of the Karaites (q.v.) by Anan ben David (cf. *JE*, i. 553 sqq.), who, in Babylon and Palestine, opposed the Talmudic learning and would have the Old Testament alone authoritative. He was the first Jew to compose a commentary on the Pentateuch. In Palestine there was propounded also a Jewish mysticism and system of ascetics whose followers called themselves "men of faith," claimed miraculous powers, and influenced all medieval Judaism. The Karaites were opposed by Saadia of Egypt, who founded Jewish science and translated the Old Testament into Arabic. His philosophic-religious system is contained fully in his *Emunoth wedeoth*, written in 943 A.D., in which he introduced Greek-Christian philosophy to the Orient.

3. Jewish Scholars in Spain.

The tenth century saw the flowering of Jewish culture in Spain, especially at the court of Abdul-Rahman III. at Cordova. The first of the series of noted Jewish scholars was Samuel Halevi ibn Nagdela (b. 993), rabbi, author and poet. Then came Jona Marinus (Merwan ibn-Ganach, 995–1050), grammarian and exegete; Solomon ibn-Gebirol, who wrote in Arabic *Mekor ḥayim,* " The Fountain of Life," a cosmogony which contained little especially Jewish except a basis in the divine word of power, being a syncretism of Neoplatonism and Aristotelianism. This was translated into Latin 100 years later and was much used by the Schoolmen. Bahya ibn-Pakuda wrote (1050–60 A.D.; cf. *JE*, ii. 447 sqq.) a " Guide to Inner Duties " based on Platonic asceticism. The celebrated Solomon bar Isaac (cf. *JE*, x. 324 sqq.), known as Rashi (q.v.), wrote his commentary in the first half of the eleventh century. The greatest Jewish poet of all the centuries was Judah Halevi (1086–1145; cf. *JE*, vii. 346 sqq.), who wrote the songs which have become the national pride of Jews. He proclaimed the sovereignty of Judaism and the preeminence of Jews on the ground that from Adam down they alone had preserved the gifts of grace and the essence of manhood. Jews were between angels and the highest rank of men; proselytes might partake of the external blessings of Jews, but could never reach the height of privilege which belonged to the native Jew. Israel is God's servant upon whom are laid the ills and hurts of mankind. The destruction of Jerusalem was of divine purpose that the earth might be leavened with the Jewish spirit. Twenty years later Abraham ibn-Daud (cf. *JE*, i. 101 sqq.) used Aristotelian philosophy to prove Judaism the one system of truth and reason. Abraham ibn-Ezra of Toledo (1088–1167; cf. *JE*, vi. 520 sqq.) was a keen critic, though a superstitious astrologer and alchemist. Most celebrated of all was Moses ben Maimun, known best as Maimonides (1135–1204; q.v.), in whom the movement just sketched reached its height. Soon after his death arose not merely the banning by the rabble of Maimonides' writings, but hostility to all study of philosophy. Jews divided themselves into followers and opponents of Maimonides, but until the time of Spinoza the Jews did nothing further for philosophy.

4. Temporal Situation in Spain to 1469.

While at first the Jews were favored under the Arabs of Spain, later they were forced either to accept Islam or to leave the country. They then began to take the side of the Christians and assisted Alfonso X. in the conquest of Seville, for which service they were given three mosques to use as synagogues. But in 1260 the old laws of the Goths were revived and new restrictions were imposed. On the other hand Christians were not to dishonor synagogues, force baptism of Jews, or employ legal measures against them on Jewish feast days. Many of these laws remained a dead letter. A little later the Dominican Raymond of Peñaforte (see DOMINIC, SAINT, AND THE DOMINICAN ORDER, § 4) undertook his mission to the Jews. At the instigation of Pope Clement IV., Jayme I. of Spain ordered that all passages in the Talmud opposing Christianity should be erased. Under Alfonso X. of Castile began a golden age for the Jews, during which they appeared at court and gained riches and position. Under Don Pedro (1350–1369) even more favorable was their situation, but with his fall great reverses were experienced. Jews were forbidden to bear Spanish names and were compelled to wear a distinguishing mark; in order to make headway against Jewish usury, to Christians Jews were ordered to remit a third of their indebtedness. Disputations took place in which the systems of Christianity and Judaism were attacked and defended. Even Jews bewailed the greed and selfishness of men of their own nation who were in positions of wealth and power, and the voices of eminent Jewish scholars were raised against such men as impious and godless. In Seville in 1391 occurred the first popular rising against the Jews, suppressed only by royal troops. Three months later, in a new uprising, 4,000 Jews were slain, the wives and children sold to Mohammedans, and two synagogues converted into churches. Many Jews suffered themselves to be baptized, among them Samuel Abrabanel; in Cordova and Toledo also many Jews became nominal Christians. These became a great danger to the Church, preserving as they did in secret their fidelity to Judaism and the Talmud, and were more under suspicion and more hated than those who had remained faithful to their religion. Some, however, showed great sincerity and endeavored to convert their brethren, among whom may be named Solomon Levi of Burgos (1353–1435; cf. *JE*, ix. 562–563), who received ordination and, as Paul of Burgos, attained a high position, becoming bishop of Seville. Other zealous converts were Joshua Lorqui, whose Christian name was Geronimo of Santa Fé, physician to Benedict XIII., and Vicente Ferrer, who even in the synagogues assailed Judaism. At this time an edict was issued assigning the Jews to special residence quarters, inhibiting certain trades, offices, and commerce with Christians, ordering a style of dress with the Jewish mark on it, and prohibiting the trimming of the beard and the carrying of weapons. Continued popular uprisings drove many of the Jews over to Christianity, while the synagogues were changed into churches. Benedict XIII. ordered a disputation which was held in Tortosa. It lasted fifteen months, and held sixty-eight sessions, in which Joshua Lorqui disputed with sixteen of the foremost rabbis. As a result Benedict issued his bull forbidding the reading of the Talmud, while the scurrilous writings on the life of Jesus were proscribed, especially the *Mar mar Jesu.* A period of literary polemics between Jews and Christians ensued which lasted for fifty years. In 1442 Pope Eugenius IV. issued a bull to the bishops of Castile and Leon enforcing the old church laws against Jews, and King John IV. put forth an edict protecting them, which the territorial limitation of his authority made of little value. Almost no Jewish literature was produced, while the works of Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, and William of Occam were translated into Hebrew. Cabalistic works continued to appear, and Jews cultivated the healing art. In the second half of the fifteenth century the charge was again made that Jews murdered Christian children, and this calumny continued in spite of repeated failure to convict in the courts. The fact that Jewish converts to Christianity held many of the most lucrative offices caused numerous anti-Jewish riots.

5. The Inquisition in Spain.

The turning-point was the marriage (1469) of Isabella of Castile to Don Ferdinand of Aragon. In 1480 the Inquisition was set at work against the Jews, with whom the prisons were soon filled, and four days after the setting up of the Holy Office six Jewish converts to Christianity were burned at the stake. Converts and all Spaniards were invited to betray converts suspected of secretly Judaizing, and a list of suspicious circumstances was published to aid in detecting the apostates. Between January and November, 1481, 298 of these supposedly false Jewish converts suffered death, while in the archbishopric of Cadiz in the same year 2,000 Jewish heretics were found. The proscribed who had already died were exhumed and their bones burned, while their property was confiscated. Sixtus IV. censured the proceedings of the inquisitors and disapproved the request of Ferdinand to have the tribunal set up in his other dominions. In 1482 Torquemada was made chief inquisitor, the Inquisition was released from restriction to legal forms and its sphere of influence extended to Aragon. Attempts were made against the highest dignitaries of Church and State if only they were of Jewish blood. At the court of Ferdinand Isaac Abrabanel was minister of finance, but in spite of his influence the edict was issued to exile all Jews from Castile, Aragon, Sicily, and Sardinia. To the number of 300,000 they fled into Portugal, Navarre, Italy, Morocco, and Turkey. The princes of Europe censured the regulations of Ferdinand, while the Sultan Bajazid remarked, "You call Ferdinand a clever king, who has impoverished his own land and made ours rich." In 1496 Emmanuel of Portugal issued an edict giving the Jews the alternative of baptism or exile. Many chose exile, thousands were baptized, while hundreds killed themselves and their families in order to escape enforced baptism.

6. Jews in France.

In France Charlemagne favored the Jews because they were the only merchants in the realm. To the embassy to Harun al-Rashid he made a Jew interpreter, and after the death of the ambassador the interpreter carried through the work of the mission. Under Louis the Pious, Jews held an important place at court, though opposed by Agobard of Lyons. At the Synod of Meaux the bishops reenacted the old ecclesiastical laws against the Jews, which Charles the Bald prevented from taking effect. Yet popular demonstrations were made against the Jews. In Toulouse it was the right of the count on Good Friday to administer to the chief of the Jewish community a box on the ear. The Jews secured immunity from this by paying a yearly tribute, and in the same way elsewhere they purchased the good will of the powerful. Hugh Capet's death in 996 was charged against the Jews because Hugh's physician was a Jew. The crusades gave new opportunities to despoil this people. The principal colony was at Narbonne, consisting of 300 families, among them that of the Hebrew grammarian Kimchi; another great colony was at Montpellier. In the twelfth century the story was told that Jews were killing the children of Christians to use their blood in the Passover. On the basis of this charge, King Philip August, about the year 1180, mulcted the Jews of his realm in 15,000 marks silver and declared all debts to Jews void except such as paid him one-fifth of the entire amount. The possessions of Jews were regarded as the property of the barons, and nobles made sales of "property and Jews." At this time arose in France the Cabala (q.v.) with its mysticism, magic and theosophy, exercising influence not only upon Jewish, but upon Christian thought, and playing its part in exegesis of both Talmud and Bible. Its force is felt to the present, since the modern Chasidism of Russia and Galicia is the Cabala in its most recent form, and its essence reflects the spirit of Jewish thought. In the third crusade the Jews of various parts of France suffered as they had in the first and second, although Pope Gregory IX. declared that the Church desired neither their enforced conversion nor their destruction. But this pope committed to the bishop of Paris the question whether the Talmud reviled Christ and his mother and contained statements derogatory of Scripture and of God. The Talmud was condemned, and in 1244 twenty-four wagon loads of copies of this work were burned in a square of the city. At this time the Jews themselves condemned and burned the writings of Maimonides. In 1269 Louis IX. required all Jews to wear a badge of yellow on breast and back, and in 1306 Philip IV. ordered them driven from the kingdom, and their gold, silver, and jewels were forfeited to him, while only their clothes were left in their possession. In 1360 they were allowed to return under favorable conditions, such as that permitting them to charge interest at eighty per cent., only to be driven out again under Charles VI. in 1394.

7. In England.

In England after the conquest by the Normans the Jews found themselves in fortunate circumstances, and in London their dwellings were like royal palaces. These conditions were first disturbed at the coronation of Richard in 1189, for when the Jews of the realm were about to bring their dues of homage, in popular uprisings in many of the cities numbers of them were slain, and some were burned in their houses. In York they intrenched themselves in the fortress and, when hope of escape was gone, set fire to it and perished in the flames. John Lackland and Henry III. extorted from them more than 10,000,000 francs, and the latter encouraged efforts to convert them (see JEWS, MISSION TO THE). In 1275 parliament by statute interdicted the collection of usury, yet Jews might buy houses and lands and engage in commerce. In 1278 the circulation of counterfeit coin was attributed to the Jews and 293 were hanged. In 1290 Jews were banned, mortgages held by them canceled, and they were compelled to sell their property; 16-000 left the country and were not permitted to return till the time of Cromwell, when individuals were permitted to settle there. Cromwell was looking for the Messianic kingdom in which he allotted a great part to the chosen race.

8. In Italy.

In Italy the Jews suffered no such hard fortune as in other lands, since the influence of the popes was there more effective, though restrictive measures were passed limiting their privileges. Under the Normans in Naples and Sicily Jews and Christians had equal privileges. The great centers of Jewish life in Italy were in the central and southern parts, not in the great Christian commercial cities of the north. In 1199 Innocent III. issued a *Constitutio Judaeorum* protecting the Jews, and this was confirmed by Gregory IX. in 1235. Innocent IV. issued a bull at the Council of Lyons of 1245 to the German and French princes, directed against the charge that Jews killed the children of Christians; he also commanded that the Talmud be protected if only it were found free from assault upon Christianity. When, in consequence of the Black Death, many Jews in South France, Spain, Savoy, on the Southern Rhine, and in Switzerland were tortured, murdered or burned, Clement VI. in a bull forbade the killing of them and the taking of their goods without due process of law, and also forcible baptism. In 1419 Martin V. issued a bull in favor of this people. But Eugenius IV. in 1442 put in force the old canonical limitations, and even intensified them, and in this course he was followed by Nicholas V. in 1447. The latter's legate to the Synod of Bamberg, Nicholas of Cusa (q.v.), directed in Germany the execution of these regulations. During the Inquisition in Spain and after the exile of Jews from Spain and Portugal, many of them found refuge in the Papal States and Turkey. The popes of those times, Alexander VI., Julius II., Leo X., and Clement VII., had Jewish physicians, and the princes of the Church followed their example. Clement disapproved of forcible baptism of adult Jews, but encouraged the baptism of Jewish children if their parents consented. He also attempted to protect the Jews who had perforce received baptism in Spain but were persecuted as unfaithful. Paul III. was charged with being more kind to Jews than to Christians, and his benefits extended to the persecuted Jewish-Christian converts of Portugal. In 1536 Charles V. obtained from Paul III. sanction of the Inquisition, but with limitations; and while following popes continued this course, it was rather regarded as an existing fact than as a legal institution, and Clement VIII. openly discountenanced it. When under Julius III. Cardinal Caraffa in 1542 made the Inquisition general throughout the Christian world and increased its rigor, in Italy attack upon the Talmud began; in 1553 the pope signed a decree of condemnation, and on the Jewish New Year's Day all copies in Rome were burned, while throughout Italy many thousand copies suffered the same fate. Under Marcellus II. the Jews were expelled from Rome in consequence of accusations of the murder of children, and Paul II., a confirmed enemy of the Jews, laid a tribute on the synagogues and enforced the old restrictions with additional enactments, while in many other ways he manifested his hostility. Against him Sultan Suleiman acted in protection of the Jews of Ancona. During this period so many Jewish-Christian converts entered the Franciscan and Jesuit orders that Paul IV. forbade the reception of Jews therein before the fourth generation. At this time the *Sohar*, the chief Cabalistic writing, was first printed by permission of the Inquisition. Pius IV. mitigated the hard conditions, and the Talmud, issued in censured form, was first printed at Basel, 1578–80. Pius V. again put in force the early restrictions with further limitations, and permitted the Jews to reside within the Papal States only at Rome and Ancona. Gregory XIII. ordered that Christian scholars acquainted with Hebrew preach to the Jews in their synagogues on feast days, and Jews were compelled to support the preachers. Clement VIII. withdrew in 1593 the decree of banishment and annulled the anti-Jewish regulations of his predecessors. Since then the popes have taken no official steps respecting the Jews with the exception of the declaration of Pius IX. in 1870 with respect to their conversion.

9. In Germany.

The Jews entered Germany with the Roman legions. Their presence at Cologne in the fourth century is demonstrable. Most of them, however, passed on into France. According to German law they had their own regulations and freedom in religion, but were without citizenship. They were dependent upon the emperor for protection, and paid a special tribute to him and to the princes. Their scholars they received from other lands. Henry II. drove them from Mainz, though they returned the next year. In Speyer they had their own quarter, protected by a wall. Forcible baptism was not allowed, in legal contests Jewish law prevailed, and the ordeal by fire and water was not applied to Jews. The first crusade in 1094 saw the first persecution of the Jews, and in Treves, Speyer, and Mainz many Jews perished. At the time of the second crusade the monk Rudolph preached against them from city to city, but they received some protection from Conrad IV. and from certain of the princes of the Church, while Bernard of Clairvaux rebuked Rudolph for his incitement to murder. For what protection the Jews received, however, they had to pay. The charges of murder were also occasions of extortion of money and of persecution. In spite of all this, the Jews contributed to the culture of the country, especially in the Minnelieder. Under Frederick II. the canonical regulation against office-holding by the Jews was enforced. Under Frederick I. of Austria the legal position of Jews was excellent, while Rudolph of Hapsburg contradicted the old charge of the murder of Christian children. Notwithstanding, popular uprisings against the Jews took place in many cities with all attendant atrocities. In 1298 the new charge of desecrating the host raised persecutions which spread over Germany and into Austria. Albrecht I. compelled many cities to pay damages and took the Jews under his protection. In the fourteenth century blame for the Black Death was laid upon them on the ground that they had poisoned wells and springs, and resulting uprisals of the population inflicted fearful sufferings upon the supposed authors of the scourge. In some cities the whole Jewish community was put to death at the stake, in others they burned themselves to death. While in many places the magistrates swore never to receive Jews back again for residence, the oath soon became a dead letter, and to Strasburg, Nuremberg, Vienna, Erfurt, Basel, Zurich, and Heilbronn the Jews returned by invitation. Campaigns against the Hussites began always with assaults upon Jews. The Council of Basel occupied itself in its nineteenth sitting with this people, ordered the enforcement of the ecclesiastical regulations, and recommended the study of Hebrew and Aramaic to the universities in order better to carry on missions among them. At the instigation of a Jewish-Christian convert named Pfefferkorn the Dominicans at Cologne began a campaign against the Talmud, and were opposed by Johann Reuchlin (q.v.), who believed that in the Talmud and the Cabala were to be found divine philosophy and the wisdom of the patriarchs. Against Reuchlin came Jakob van Hoogstraten (q.v.) with his composition on the "Destruction of the Cabala." In 1509 Pfefferkorn obtained an order from Emperor Maximilian to the Jews to deliver to the former all their anti-Christian writings, and a second edict directed Hoogstraten, Reuchlin, a Jewish-Christian named Viktor von Karben, and certain universities to pronounce upon the contents. Reuchlin adduced what he declared to be Christ's testimony to the Talmud as a witness for Christian verity. Reuchlin and Pfefferkorn engaged in a campaign of nicknames into which the archbishop of Mainz intruded, the humanists of Germany took the part of Reuchlin with an anti-ecclesiastical bias, and Luther found therein one of his opportunities (see Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum). In several of his utterances he manifested favor to the Jews, though later he reversed his position and violently assailed them, so that the Reformation did not bring to them the relief they expected. But in 1544 Charles V. restored to the Jews their privileges and declared them not guilty of murdering Christian children for Passover purposes.

10. Revival of Messianism.

The suspicions and attacks under which the Jews after the twelfth century had suffered throughout Europe prevented expansion and growth of spiritual life, and a further hindrance was the opposition of the rabbis to the study of philosophy on the ground that it led to Christianity and heresy. Hence the Jews became superstitious and sank into the practise of magic and into religious fanaticism. Consequently the people came to look for Messianic deliverance, and under the pressure of constant reports of coming relief Shabbethai Ẓebi (b. in Smyrna in 1626) claimed to be the Messiah, put forth prophecies, and in the year 1666, reckoned by Jews as the year of the coming redemption, went to Jerusalem, while another Jew assumed the rôle of Elijah. The greatest expectations were aroused among his own people throughout Europe. Had Shabbethai possessed the qualities requisite for the carrying out of such a scheme, he would have caused the greatest movement of modern times among the Jews. But in 1666 the Turkish cadi sent him to the sultan at Constantinople, who put on him a white turban and a green mantle and made him, as Mehemed Effendi, his doorkeeper, while the Jews of Europe were plunged into shame and chagrin. Among the more intelligent Jews this one experience killed all seeds of the Messianic hope. But the ignorant masses of the East still had expectations, and in 1720 in Galicia Jacob Frank (q.v.) claimed to be the reincarnated Shabbethai and gained a following which replaced the Talmud by the Sohar. The Chasidim of Russia and Poland, named from Juda Chasid, are the remainder of a movement similar to that inaugurated by Frank. Among them ecstasy is sought with the aid of stimulants, asceticism is practised, and the Sohar is regarded as of the highest value (see Chasidim, 2). Contemporaneous with these outbreaks of fanaticism and superstition were the life and momentous work of Baruch Spinoza (1632–77), whose achievements prove that the inner genius of Judaism could not be destroyed by opposing external forces or by internal error, though indeed official Judaism sought to destroy by ban and actual attack the man who glorified this race.

11. Jews in Poland.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Poland became the chief center of Judaism. Since the fourteenth century that land had been the refuge of persecuted Jews from the west of Europe, especially from Germany. Consequently Russian and Polish Jews came to use a mixed dialect of which the foundation is German with Russian, Polish and Hebrew words mingled, and this dialect has produced a literature. Settlement of Jews from the East was made in quite early times. Gregory IX. urged King Andrew to exclude Jews and Mohammedans from office, and the synod of Ofen (1279) ordered Jews to wear a red wheel on the left breast. Casimir the Great renewed and extended in 1334 the favorable laws of a century earlier, requiring the accordant testimony of three Jews and three Christians to convict a Jew of the crime of murder of a Christian child; thirteen years later he limited the privileges accorded Jews. During a pestilence the Jews of the principal cities were attacked by the populace. Casimir IV. made the laws still more favorable, but Cardinal Olesnick permitted the monk Capistrano, "the scourge of the Jews," to preach against them, and Casimir had to withdraw his concessions. Sigismund I. (1506–48) protected the Jews. Meanwhile the study of the Talmud had flourished under the care of German Jews in Poland, and Joseph Caro produced the *Shulḥan Aruch*, which has remained the guide of life for Jews since, while the Talmudic schools of the land became celebrated in all Europe. Study of the Bible languished, only one work of importance being issued, the *Ḥizzuḳ emunah* by Isaac Troki (cf. *JE*, xii. 265–266), a keen polemic against the Gospels and Christianity. During the seventeenth century the Jews of Poland were ruled by their own rabbis, constituting a state within a state with an annual synod. But under this régime and a narrowing of studies to matters of legal refinement, the character of the people had deteriorated, while the Polish impress stamped all European Judaism, except that of Spain, with the traits most disliked by the European peoples. Polish Jews became compromised in an attempt to reduce to serfage the cossacks of Ukraine, and many thousands perished, and a large number were killed in the Russian-Swedish war under Charles X. It is said that 180,000 families perished, 1648–1658, and Polish Judaism lost its eminent position.

4. The New Period: By the end of the eighteenth century a general deterioration and rankness of religious life had conquered Judaism all over the world; if the people was to be saved, a rebirth was necessary for the whole people. The reformation of the inner spirit of Judaism began in Germany through Moses Mendelssohn (q.v.); the betterment of the external situation began with the emancipation of the Jews of France. The great elector, Frederick William, had settled fifty Jewish families from Vienna in Berlin, and to that place came Mendelssohn, and gave himself to educational and philosophical work. His reputation, recognized even by Christians, stimulated the younger Jews to care for larger interests, and study of the Talmud alone no longer satisfied. His translation of the Pentateuch into German, though necessarily printed in Hebrew type, had great influence, though use of it was forbidden by the rabbis. Following his lead, a generation of authors sprang up having the purpose to release the Jewish people and religion from the superstition and regard for mere ceremony into which they had fallen, to break the yoke of Talmudism, and substitute the Bible as the basis of life. In France in 1791 Jews were given the right of citizenship, though this was withdrawn in Alsace in 1808. In 1812, after six years of preparatory measures, Napoleon declared the Jews of the empire eligible to citizenship, though in the free cities of Germany this right had to be purchased, and it was afterward withdrawn. Progress toward the same end of freedom for the Jews was made in other European countries. In Germany most of the states took the religion under their protection. Many Jews became Christians, others set up reformed synagogues (as in Cassel and Hamburg). Yet in 1819 there broke out a new popular uprising against the Jews, in which life and property were destroyed. Against the reform tendency in Judaism and the movement toward Christianity arose an orthodox party fostering the early ideals. Jewish consciousness of its past and a new awakening of Jewish spirit was brought about by the *Geschichte der Israeliten* (9 vols., 1820–29) of I. M. Jost (q.v.), while works on Jewish history, poetry, and philosophy, and on the linguistics of the Hebrew tongue further stimulated the newly awakened interest. While Abraham Geiger (q.v.) had a leading part in this movement, the political support gained in France through the help given to Louis Philippe in 1830 by the Rothschilds furthered the cause. The spirit of liberalism spread, the literary activities of Heine, Börne, and Gabriel Riesser contributed to its growth and many Jews accepted Christianity. An event in the East raised again the Jewish question in Europe. In Damascus, which reckoned among its 120,000 inhabitants 5,000 Jews, Father Tomaso, the guardian of the Capuchins, and his servants disappeared. Seven of the richest Jews were accused of murdering them, their houses were attacked and destroyed in the effort to find the bodies, while the owners and other Jews were slain or arrested. The Jewish financial houses of Europe interested France, England and Austria in protecting the Jews, and an international court under Mohammed Ali of Egypt was established to investigate the case. The general result was a unification of feeling among the Jews of Europe, and this was extended to the East by the establishment there of schools to raise the level of knowledge among the Jews of the Orient. A specially important movement was the founding of the Alliance Israélite Universelle at Paris under the leadership of Adolphe Crémieux, who had been a guiding spirit during the entire course of events. The result of the revolutionary movements of 1848 in Paris, Vienna, Berlin, Italy, and elsewhere was the triumph of liberalism with the advancement of the Jews as an inevitable consequence. A reaction occurred, beginning in 1870, and antisemitism expressed itself, especially in Germany, in attacks upon the Jewish quarters, while this feeling and its consequent riots and legal limitations spread into Russia, Rumania, Austria, and France. The consequence of the feeling of insecurity thus awakened among Jews was the establishment in Vienna by Theodor Herzl of the Zionist movement, the object of which is the founding of a Jewish state in Palestine in which all persecuted Jews may find a secure refuge. (F. Heman.)

1. Early Settlements.

5. Jews in America. After the expulsion of Jews from Spain in 1492, and from Portugal in 1497, a considerable number of them nominally adopted Christianity but retained their Jewish creed and practises in secret. Columbus, on his first voyage, was accompanied by several of these Maranos, or secret Jews; many Maranos visited or settled in Spanish or Portuguese America, and, when their creed was discovered, became victims of the Inquisition. By their wide connection with the Spanish Jews who had settled in Holland and the Levant, they contributed to international trade across the Atlantic. Owing to a natural sympathy with Holland, those of Brazil took the part of the Dutch in the conflict between Holland and Portugal for the possession of that country, and when the Dutch were expelled from Pernambuco and Rio Janeiro in 1654 a considerable number of Jews left with them and went to the West India Islands. Some twenty-three of these emigrated to New York in the summer of that year, and obtained a footing there through the influence of the Dutch West India Company, among the founders and members of which were a number of Amsterdam Jews. Four years later fifteen Jewish families arrived at Newport, R. I., and established a congregation there, under the direction of Aaron Lopez, one of the leading merchants of the country, about 1650. It is possible that Jews had appeared even earlier in Maryland; but the first of importance there was Jacob Lumbroso, a physician of distinction. These places and Philadelphia, Savannah, and Charleston constituted the chief seats of Jewish settlement in the latter half of the seventeenth and the first part of the eighteenth century; the settlers were mostly of the Sephardic, or Spanish branch of the

Jewish people, though occasionally a few English Jews were found among them. Toward the close of the colonial period Jews had spread to Lancaster, Philadelphia, and Leicester, Mass., and the majority of them took the revolutionary side in the struggle with England, some of them fighting in the ranks, twenty-four of whom held commissions. Robert Morris was helped to finance the Revolution by the aid of Haym Salomon.

2. In the United States, 1800–1880.

It has been calculated that at the beginning of the nineteenth century there were about 2,000 Jews in the United States, of whom 800 were in Charleston, 500 in New York, 150 in Philadelphia, and the remainder scattered. Their numbers were soon increased by migrations from England and Germany, the latter chiefly after the failure of the Liberal movement in 1848. These were among the first of Austin's colonists in Texas in 1821, and the cities of Waco and Castroville still testify to the important position held in early Texas by Jacob de Cordova, who laid out the former, and Henry Castro, who founded the latter. The Jews also helped in the earlier development of California, Solomon Heydenfeld being chief justice of that state up to 1857, while among the pioneers in the commerce of that state Jews were numbered. The period from 1848 to 1880 marked the immigration of German Jews who had taken part in the liberal movements in Germany in 1848 and had come to America to escape the reaction which followed it. These to the number of not less than 7,000 showed their devotion to their adopted country by taking part on both sides of the fraternal strife of the Civil War. Meanwhile, Jews had been in various directions establishing their positions as American citizens and claiming the rights thereof. Even in the early days of the eighteenth century several of the colonies passed laws permitting Jews to become naturalized without the oath on "the true faith of a Christian" still demanded in the mother country. The English act of 1740 permitted this throughout the colonies. In Maryland between 1776 and 1825 the political disabilities of the Jews were entirely removed, mainly by the activity of Jacob I. Cohen and Solomon Etting. The Board of Delegates of American Israelites had been formed for activity where religious discrimination was brought against Americans on account of their creed as Jews. Several American Jews in this early period served abroad as diplomatic agents of the United States.

3. Reform, Educational, and Charitable Movements.

Internally, movements for reform in the ritual took place among American Jews as among their European brethren, the first being at Charleston as early as 1825, but the chief movements in this direction came with the migration of German Jews in 1848. Under the leadership of Rabbis David Einhorn and Isaac Mayer Wise, a wave of reform spread throughout American Jewry, though a large number of the older established congregations still retained the older and more orthodox ritual. Two colleges were founded by the opposite parties to train ministers, the Maimonides College at Philadelphia, founded in 1867, by Isaac Leeser, the leader of the more conservative Jews, and the Hebrew Union College in 1875 in Cincinnati, O., by Isaac Mayer Wise, who had likewise established the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, which combined the ministers of the more radical direction and unified the reform ritual by a standard "Union Prayer Book." A more extreme development of the reform position was founded by Felix Adler (q.v.) in New York in 1883, and is known as the Ethical Culture movement (see ETHICAL CULTURE, SOCIETIES FOR). Among the most characteristic features of American Jewry during the period from 1848 to 1880 are the many fraternal organizations which combined educational, charitable and benefit features and served as Jewish centers in small communities where no congregations or synagogues existed. Most congregations had established some charitable features, but few specially philanthropic institutions were found necessary. The first Jewish hospital, Mount Sinai, was founded in 1852 in New York, and the first orphan asylum in 1855 at New Orleans, under the auspices of Judah Touro.

4. The New Immigration Since 1880.

In 1880 it was reckoned that there were about 250,000 Jews in the United States, of whom 75,000 were in New York, 16,000 in San Francisco, 12,000 in Philadelphia, 10,000 in Chicago, 8,000 in Cincinnati, 6,000 in St. Louis, and the rest scattered. In the following year commenced extensive migrations from Russia, due to the massacres and persecutions which began then and have continued down to the present. It is estimated that at least 1,250,000 Jews have entered the United States since 1881, two-thirds of them from Russia. With the advent of this huge and increasing stream of immigrants, mostly ill provided with means of livelihood, a total change came over the spirit of American Israel. The older Jewish inhabitants hastened to form institutions to assist their persecuted brethren in settling in the land of liberty. Baron de Hirsch placed a sum of two and one-half millions of dollars at the disposal of an American committee in 1890 for the special purpose of providing for the new arrivals; this fund has founded agricultural colonies and industrial schools. In New York the Educational Alliance has been established to instruct the newcomers in the English language and in their duties as prospective American citizens. Hospitals, orphan asylums, and homes for the aged have been established in all the great Jewish centers, and uniform methods of treatment have been developed under the auspices of the National Conference of Jewish Charities organized in Cincinnati in 1899, which numbers over fifty philanthropic organizations throughout the country. The various charitable bodies have been federated in Philadelphia, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Chicago, Boston, Detroit, Kansas City and Cleveland, and it is reckoned that these bodies, together with the chief Jewish institutions of New York, distribute five millions of dollars annually for relief, industrial training and other philanthropic objects. More recently the Russian Jews, who have prospered remarkably, have established independent institutions to care for their poorer brethren. The majority of the newcomers are of the orthodox wing of Judaism, so that whereas before the "eighties" the majority of American Jews were probably attached to reform congregations, at least five-sixths of the 1,200 congregations now in the United States are of the more conservative section. In order to supply these with rabbis, the Jewish Theological Seminary of America was established by Sabato Morais in New York in 1895, and was reorganized in 1902 under the presidency of Solomon Schechter (q.v.). This institution has now one of the largest Hebrew libraries in the world.

5. The Press; General Conditions.

Jews have their own press, the first periodical being *The Jew* in New York 1823–25, the next important one being *The Occident*, Philadelphia, edited by Isaac Leeser, 1843–1869. The more important weeklies are *American Israelite* of Cincinnati, established in 1854; *Jewish Messenger*, New York, 1857–1902; *The American Hebrew*, New York, 1879; *Jewish Exponent*, Philadelphia, 1887; *Reform Advocate*, Chicago, 1891, and *Jewish Comment*, Baltimore, 1895. The newcomers have also founded a press of their own in Yiddish, a dialect of archaic German printed in Hebrew characters. The chief paper is the *Jewish Daily News* of New York. The Jewish Publication Society of America, founded in 1889, issues works adapted for popular reading, its most memorable publications being Graetz's *History of the Jews*, Israel Zangwill's *Children of the Ghetto*, and Schechter's *Studies in Judaism*. American Judaism has not hitherto produced any important contributions to Jewish learning, though the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, in twelve volumes (New York, 1900–06) summarizes for the first time the results of the Jewish scholarship of Europe and is being translated into Hebrew and Russian. Owing to the large increase in the number of American Jews, the government has of recent years taken action to protest against the persecutions in Europe which lead to such burdens being cast upon America by the illiberal and persecuting action of despotic governments. Meetings of protest have been held throughout the country against Russian tyranny in 1881, 1893, and after the Kishineff massacres in 1903, when a fund of over one million dollars was collected in America by a Jewish relief committee. In order to take continuous action in such cases an American Jewish Committee was formed in 1906 of representative Jews throughout the country. Jews have taken part in the higher activities of American life in numbers far beyond their numerical proportions. They have had eminent representatives among the officers of the army and navy, in the United States Senate, in the learned professions, among artists and inventors, and in literature. Altogether, the Jews of the United States have perhaps the most fortunate and influential position of any Jews throughout the world. They number nearly two millions (half of them in New York), about one-sixth of the whole number of Jews, and they show exceptional capacity to enter into the democratic life of America.

JOSEPH JACOBS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the general history abundant literature, touching the various phases, will be found cited under AHAB; ARCHEOLOGY, BIBLICAL; BIBLICAL THEOLOGY; INQUISITION; CABALA; TALMUD; ZIONISM. Supplementing these lists of literature the reader may consult: W. D. Morrison, *Jews under Roman Rule*, London, 1890; W. H. Kosters, *Widerherstellung Israels*, Heidelberg, 1895; J. P. Peters, *The Early Hebrew Story*, New York, 1904; J. C. Todd, *Politics and Religion in Ancient Israel*, ib. 1904; M. Friedländer, *Die religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu*, Berlin, 1905; R. L. Ottley, *Religion in Israel*, London, 1905; W. E. Addis, *Hebrew Religion to the Establishment of Judaism*, ib. 1906; B. Baentsch, *Altorientalischer und israelitischer Monotheismus*, Tübingen, 1906; A. Lods, *La Croyance à la vie future et le culte des morts dans l'antiquité israélite*, 2 vols., Paris, 1906; E. Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, Halle, 1906; K. Marti, *Die Religion des A. T.*, Tübingen, 1906, Eng. transl., London, 1907; W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums in neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, Göttingen, 1907; T. K. Cheyne, *Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel*, London, 1907; idem, *Decline and Fall of the Kingdom of Judah*, ib. 1907; F. Stähelin, *Probleme der israelitischen Geschichte*, Basel, 1907; P. Wendland, *Die hellenistich-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum*, Tübingen, 1907; S. A. Cook, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the 2d Millennium, B.C.*, Edinburgh, 1908; J. B. D. Eerdmans, *Alttestamentliche Studien, II., Die Vorgeschichte Israels*, Giessen, 1908; W. Fairweather, *The Background of the Gospels ; or, Judaism Between the Old and the New Testaments*, Edinburgh, 1908; P. Goodman, *The Synagogue and the Church*, London, 1908; C. H. H. Wright, *Light From Egyptian Papyri on Jewish Hist. Before Christ*, ib., 1908; M. Löhr, *Das Weib in Jahwe-Religion und Kult*, Leipsic, 1908.

For post-Biblical history, individual and general, the best thesaurus is the *JE*, which has taken a fully authoritative position on matters Jewish. On various phases consult: M. J. Jost, *Geschichte des Judentums und seinen Sekten*, 3 vols., Leipsic, 1857–59; A. Neubauer and M. Stern, *Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während der Kreuzzüge*, Berlin, 1892; H. J. M. Coudenhove, *Das Wesen des Antisemitismus*, Berlin, 1901; H. Graetz, *Volkstümliche Geschichte der Juden*, 3 vols., Leipsic, 1905; E. N. Adler, *Jews in Many Lands*, Philadelphia, 1905; S. Funk, *Die Juden in Babylonien 200–500*, Berlin, 1902; M. Franco, *Hist. et littérature juives pays par pays*, Paris, 1905; M. C. Peters, *The Jew as a Patriot*, New York, 1902; D. Philipson, *The Reform Movement in Judaism*, London, 1907; G. F. Abbott, *Israel in Europe*, New York, 1907; M. Harris, *Hist. of the Mediæval Jews from the Moslem Conquest of Spain to the Discovery of America*, ib. 1907.

For Judaism in different lands consult: On England: J. Picciotto, *Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History*, London, 1870; J. Jacobs, *The Jews of Angevin England*, ib. 1893 (a collection of sources); L. Wolf, *Manasseh ben Israel's Mission to . . . Cromwell*, ib. 1901; *Select Pleas, Starrs, and Other Records from the Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, 1220–1234*, ib. 1902; *Calendar of the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews*, ed. J. M. Rigg, vol. i., 1218–1272, ib. 1905; *Celebration of the 250th Anniversary of the Whitehall Conference*, ib. 1905; A. M. Hyamson, *A Hist. of the Jews in England*, London, 1908. On France: J. Aronius, *Regesten zur Geschichte der Juden im fränkischen und deutschen Reiche bis zum . . 1273*, Berlin, 1887–1902; X. Gasnos, *Étude sur la condition des Juifs dans l'ancien droit français*, Angers, 1897; S. Kahn, *Notice sur les Israélites de Nîmes, 672–1808*, Nîmes, 1901; H. Lucien-Brun, *La Condition des Juifs en France depuis 1789*, Paris, 1901. On Germany and Austria: J. Aronius, ut sup.; M. Friedländer, *Materialen zur Geschichte der Juden in Böhmen*, Brünn, 1888; E. Nuebling, *Die Judengemeinden des Mittelalters*, Ulm, 1896; J. E. Scherer, *Die Rechtsverhältnisse der Juden in den deutsch-österreichischen Ländern*, Leipsic, 1901; G. Liebe, *Das Judentum in der deutschen Vergangenheit*, Jena, 1903. On Rumania: E. Sincerus, *Les Juifs en Roumanie depuis le traité de Berlin*, London, 1901; B. Lazare, *Les Juifs en Roumanie*, Paris, 1902; I. Lahovarie, *The Jewish Question in Roumania*, ib., 1903. On Russia and Poland: M. Davitt, *The Story of Anti-Semitic Persecutions in Russia*, London, 1903; S. Spinner, *Etwas über den Stand der Cultur bei den Juden in Polen in 16. Jahrhundert*, Vienna, 1903. On Spain and Portugal: E. H. Lindo, *Hist. of the Jews of Spain and Portugal*, London, 1848; F. D.

Moscatta, *Jews of Spain and Portugal and the Inquisition*, ib. 1877; A. Pulido Fernandez, *Españoles sin patria y la raza Sefardí*, Madrid, 1905. On the United States: I. Markens, *Hebrews in America*, 1885; *Judaism at the World's Parliament of Religions*, Cincinnati, 1894; C. S. Bernheimer, *The Russian Jew in the United States*, Philadelphia, 1905; *The Two Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Jews in the United States: Addresses at Carnegie Hall, Thanksgiving Day, 1905*, New York, 1905. B. A. Elzas, *The Jews of South Carolina*, Philadelphia, 1906; and the publications of the Jewish Historical Society. On other lands: G. Meynie, *L'Algérie juive*, Paris, 1887; D. Cazes, *Hist. des Israélites de Tunisie*, ib. 1888; G. Corneilhan, *Le Judaisme en Egypte et en Syrie*, ib. 1889; L. Burieu, *Les Juifs algériens*, ib. 1902; A. Steinberg, *Studien zur Geschichte der Juden in der Schweiz*, Zurich, 1902; J. H. Lord, *The Jews of India and the Far East*, Bombay, 1906; J. Chalom, *Les Israélites de la Tunisie*, Paris, 1908.

On post-Biblical literature consult: M. Steinschneider, *Die arabische Literatur der Juden*, Frankfort, 1902; J. Guttmann, *Die Scholastic des 13. Jahrhunderts in ihren Beziehungen zum Judentum*, Breslau, 1902; H. Brody and K. Albrecht, *The New-Hebrew School of Poets of the Spanish-Arabian Epoch*, Leipsic, 1906; I. Abrahams, *A Short Hist. of Jewish Literature from the Fall of the Temple*, London, 1906; D. Neumark, *Geschichte der jüdischen Philosophie des Mittelalters*, vol. i., Berlin, 1907; Nathaniel ibn al-Fayyumi, *The Bustan alukul, ed. and transl. from a unique MS. . . . by D. Levine*, New York, 1908.

ITALA. See Bible Versions, A, II., 1.

ITALY.

I. The Roman Catholic Church.
  Modern Status in the State (§ 1).
  Position of the Pope (§ 2).
  Organization (§ 3).
  The Old Catholics (§ 4).
II. Protestant Bodies.
  The Waldensian Church (§ 1).
  The Evangelical Italian Church (§ 2).
  Foreign Missionary Congregations and Churches (§ 3).
  Benevolent Institutions (§ 4).
  Bible and Tract Societies (§ 5).
  Periodicals (§ 6).

The present kingdom of Italy, comprising besides the main peninsula the islands of Sicily and Sardinia, and a number of smaller islands, was formed in Mar., 1861. The total area is 110,659 square miles; population (1901), 32,475,253, of whom 31,539,863 (99.7 per cent.) are Roman Catholics, 65,595 Protestants (including 20,538 foreigners), and 35,617 Jews. The capital is Rome. Religious liberty prevails, and adherents of all faiths enjoy equal civil and political rights.

1. Modern Status in the State.

I. The Roman Catholic Church: Until 1848 the Roman Catholic clergy, including the religious orders, occupied an exceptional position in Italy. They were exempt from taxation and from temporal jurisdiction, and had the public educational and charitable institutions entirely in their hands. The kingdom of Sardinia took the lead in bringing about the new order. By law of Aug. 25, 1848, the Jesuits were excluded, as also the Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and a law of Mar. 1, 1850, placed all ecclesiastical institutions of a beneficent character under state supervision. Other statutes put an end to exemption from temporal jurisdiction and taxation, forbade religious institutions to receive gifts without royal sanction, and levied an annual tax on the receipts of the "dead hand" (see Mortmain). By the law of May 29, 1855, all religious orders in Sardinia not engaged in preaching, teaching, or nursing the sick, were dissolved and their property alienated by the State. On the basis of this law 274 monasteries, with 3,733 monks, and sixty-one convents, with 1,756 inmates, were closed, and 2,722 chapters and private benefices were disestablished. In 1861 the same principles were carried out in Umbria, in the Marches, and in Naples. These principles were applied to the entire kingdom of Italy by the laws of July 7, 1866, Aug. 15, 1867, and June 19, 1873. The property thus acquired by the State was formed into an ecclesiastical fund (*Fondo per il culto*) for the support of religious worship and public education, and for the payment of pensions to monks and nuns of closed monasteries. Since the suppressed orders might continue to exist as private associations, there are still about 40,000 monks in Italy. Up to June 30, 1898, 44,376 ecclesiastical foundations had come into the possession of the State. The annual income from this property is about 33,000,000 lire. All chapels and churches used for public worship are exempt from confiscation, as also episcopal residences, together with the official buildings connected with them, clerical seminaries, and such cloisters as were turned over to the provinces or communes for public purposes, educational or charitable. All the Roman Catholic theological faculties in the seventeen state universities were abolished by law in 1873.

2. Position of the Pope.

The temporal power of the pope was quietly brought to an end Sept. 20, 1870, but on May 13, 1871, a law was passed guaranteeing his independence, and making his person sacred and inviolable, like that of the king. The honors of sovereignty are due to him, and he is allowed to keep a bodyguard. The State grants him annually a pension of 3,225,000 lire, which, however, he has hitherto declined to receive; and the palaces of the Vatican and the Lateran, and the villa of Castel Gandolfo (near Albano), with their libraries and collections, are declared to be the property of the holy see, inalienable, free of taxation, and exempted from expropriation. The Italian Government furthermore guarantees the freedom and independence of the conclave, and of all ecclesiastical officers in the execution of their official functions. In the city of Rome, all seminaries, academies, and colleges for the education of the clergy remain under the special authority of the pope; and the State has renounced its right of appointment and nomination to the higher ecclesiastical benefices. No Italian bishop is compelled to take the oath to the king, and no royal *placet* is necessary to the execution of a purely ecclesiastical act. Meanwhile the pope resides in the Vatican, keeping a court of about 1,800 persons, and maintaining the Curia (q.v.) for the government of the Roman Catholic Church at large. Foreign countries represented at the Vatican are: Austria-Hungary, Bavaria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Monaco, Nicaragua, Peru, Portugal, Prussia, Russia, San Domingo, and Spain.

The Roman Catholic Church in Italy numbers 49 archbishoprics, 221 bishoprics, and some 25,000 parishes. Hierarchically, the Church in Italy is divided into (1) the diocese of Rome, with the six suburban cardinal-bishoprics of Albano, Frascati, Ostia-Velletri, Palestrina, Porto, and Sabina;

3. Organization.

(2) exempt bishoprics and archbishoprics, i.e., those that are immediately under the pope; and (3) metropolitan bishoprics, with their suffragan bishoprics. The exempt archbishoprics and bishoprics are as follows: in Liguria, the bishopric of Luni-Sarzana; in Venice, the archbishopric of Udine; in the former Papal States, the archbishoprics of Camerino, Ferrara, Perugia, and Spoleto, and the bishoprics of Aquapendente, Alatri, Amelia, Anagni, Ancona, Ascoli, Assisi, Bagnorea, Citta di Castello, Citta della Pieve, Civita Castellana, Corneto, Fabriano, Fano, Ferentino, Foligno, Gubbio, Jesi, Montefiascone, Narni, Nocera, Norcia, Orvieto, Osimo, Poggio Mirteto, Recanati, Rieti, Segni, Sutri-Nepi, Terni, Terracina, Tivoli, Todi, Treja, Veroli, and Viterbo; in Tuscany, the archbishopric of Lucca, and the bishoprics of Arezzo, Cortona, Montalcino, and Montepulciano; in Emilia, the bishoprics of Borgo San Donnino, Parma, and Piacenza; in the province of Naples, the archbishoprics of Amalfi, Aquila, Cosenza Gaeta, and Rossano, and the bishoprics of Aquino, Aversa, Cava-Sarno, Foggia, Gravina, San Marco, Marsi, Melfi, Mileto, Molfetta, Monopoli, Nardò, Penne-Atri, Teramo, Trivento, Troja, and Sulmona; in Sicily, the archbishopric of Catania, and the bishopric of Acireale. The metropolitan seats with their suffragans are: Acerenza-Matera (suffragans: Anglona-Tursi, Potenza, Tricarico, Venosa); Bari-Canosa (Conversano, Ruvo-Bitonto); Benevent (Alife, Ariano, Ascoli-Cerignola, Avellino, Bojano, Bovino, Larino, Lucera, San Severo, Sant' Agata de' Goti, Telese, Termoli); Bologna (Faenza, Imola); Brindisi (Ostuni); Cagliari (Galtelli-Nuovo, Iglesias, Ogliastra); Capua (Cajazzo, Calvi-Teano, Caserta, Isernia-Venafro, Sessa); Chieti (Vasto); Conza-Campagna (Lacedonia, Muro, Sant' Angelo de' Lombardi); Fermo (Macerata-Tolentino, Montalto, Ripatransone, San Severino); Florence (San Sepolcro, Colle, Fiesole, Modigliana, Pistoja-Prato, San Miniato); Genoa (Albenga, Bobbio, Brugnato, Savona-Noli, Tortona, Ventimiglia); Lanciano (Ortona); Manfredonia (Viesti); Messina (Lipari, Nicosia, Patti); Milan (Bergamo, Brescia, Como, Crema, Cremona, Lodi, Mantua, Pavia); Modena (Carpi, Guastalla, Massa di Carrara, Reggio Emilia); Monreale (Caltanisetta, Girgenti); Naples (Acera, Ischia, Nola, Pozzuoli); Oristano (Ales-Terralba); Otranto (Gallipoli, Lecce, Ugento); Palermo (Cefalu, Mazzara, Trapani); Pisa (Livorno, Pescia, Pontremoli, Volterra); Ravenna (Bertinoro, Cervia, Cesena, Comacchio, Forli, Rimini, Sarsina); Reggio di Calabria (Bova, Cassano, Catanzaro, Cotrone, Gerace, Nicastro, Nicotera, Oppido, Squillace); Salerno-Acerno (Capaccio-Vallo, Diano, Marsico, Nocera dei Pagani, Nusco, Policastro); Santa Severina (Cariati); Sassari (Alghero, Ampurias, Bisarchio, Bosa); Siena (Chiusi, Grosseto, Massa Marittima, Savana-Pitigliano); Syracuse (Caltagirone, Noto, Piazza); Sorrent (Castellamare); Taranto (Castellaneta, Oria); Turin (Acqui, Alba, Aosta, Asti, Cuneo, Fossano, Ivrea, Mondovi, Pinerolo, Saluzzo, Susa); Trani (Andria, Bisceglie); Urbino (Cagli, Fossombrone, Montefeltro, Pesaro, Sinigaglia, Urbania-Sant' Angelo in Vado); Venice (Adria, Belluno, Ceneda, Chioggia, Concordia, Padua, Treviso, Verona, Vicenza); and Vercelli (Alessandria della Paglia, Biella, Casale, Novara, Vigevano). There are also eleven abbeys and prelatures without dioceses, viz.: Altamura, Monte Cassino, Monte Oliveto Maggiore, Monte Vergine, Nonantola, Santa Lucia del Mela, San Martino al Monte Cimino, San Paolo fuori le Mura di Roma, Sanctissima Trinita della Cave dei Tirreni, SS. Vicenzo ed Anastasio alle tre Fontane (near Rome), and Subiaco. There are Uniat Greek congregations in Naples, Messina, and Barletta.

4. The Old Catholics.

The Old Catholics in Italy number about 1,000. They have a bishop, and less than a dozen ministers. Their largest parishes are Arrone, in the province of Perugia; Dovadola, in the province of Florence; Sant' Angelo de' Lombardi, in the province of Avellino; and San Remo, in the Riviera di Ponente. The sect was founded in Italy by Count Enrico de Campello (q.v.).

II. Protestant Bodies: The Protestant cause in Italy is represented by the old and celebrated Church of the Waldenses (q.v.); by the Evangelical Italian Church; and by congregations of Baptists, Wesleyans, and (American) Methodists.

1. The Waldensian Church.

When religious liberty was established in the kingdom of Sardinia by the decree of Feb. 17, 1848, the Waldenses (q.v.) in Italy had eighteen ministers and fifteen congregations, all in the Piedmont region. The congregations of Pinerolo and Turin were established later. The number of Waldenses in Piedmont and the adjacent valleys is about 13,000. In 1898 the Waldensian College, established at Torre Pellice in 1835, was placed upon an equal footing with similar state institutions. It has about a dozen teachers and about 100 pupils. The Waldenses also maintain high schools, orphan asylums, and a hospital. Their theological school, founded at Torre Pellice in 1835, was removed to Florence in 1860. The Waldensians, by sixty years of missionary activity, have now established new congregations throughout Italy, some fifty in number, with as many more mission stations, comprehending about 6,000 communicants. The affairs of the entire Church are administered by a board of five members, elected by the synod, which meets yearly at Torre Pellice, in September. Since 1861 the mission field, with the new congregations, has been administered by an Evangelization Committee of eight members, also elected by the synod. The Church maintains elementary and Sunday schools, and employs some two dozen colporteurs for the distribution of Bibles and evangelical writings.

2. The Evangelical Italian Church.

The Evangelical Italian Church was founded at Milan, in 1870, by twenty-three separate congregations that had been formed here and there independently of the Waldensian evangelization. To show clearly its separation from the papacy and the Roman hierarchy this church called itself the "Free Italian Church." [Its most eminent leader was the eloquent Gavazzi.] A general convention in 1870 adopted eight fundamental articles of faith, and the next assembly at Florence in 1871 adopted a constitution of twenty-one articles. By royal decree of July 2, 1891, this church was recognized by the Italian government as a juristic person, under the name "Evangelical Italian Church" (*Chiesa Evangelica Italiana*), the name by which it has since then been known. The affairs of the church are in the hands of an Evangelization Committee, composed of five members elected by the general convention, which meets annually at Florence. The entire church is divided into ten districts, viz., Piedmont, Liguria, Lombardy, Venice, Emilia, Tuscany, Rome, Naples, Apulia, and Sicily. These embrace, all together, some forty congregations, forty-five stations, and about 2,000 communicants. The church maintains elementary and Sunday schools, and a theological school at Florence. The church also employs a number of colporteurs for the sale of Bibles and evangelical works. In connection with the Evangelical Italian Church may be mentioned the Free Christian Church, which resembles the Plymouth Brethren. [The Evangelical Italian Church and the Free Christian Church are now for the most part allied with the Waldensians and the Methodists.]

The English Wesleyans, who have been represented in Italy since 1861, have in their northern district twenty-five churches and stations, and in

3. Foreign Missionary Congregations and Churches.

their southern district twenty-five churches and stations, numbering all together some 2,000 communicants. They maintain elementary schools, and an orphan asylum at Intra. The Methodist Episcopal Church (of America) began missionary work in Italy in 1873. It now numbers twelve churches, forty mission stations, and about 1,500 communicants. It has day and evening schools employing upward of forty teachers, and also a theological school at Rome. The United Baptists, American and English, have been in Italy since 1870 and 1871. All together, they have eighty-one stations, some forty ministers, five colporteurs, and about 1,500 communicants. [George B. Taylor (d. at Rome in 1906) was for forty years at the head of the American Baptist Mission.] An independent missionary work is carried on by the Englishman Clarke in Spezia, Arcola, Belluno, Levanto, Marola, Pordenone, and Seren.

There are English churches in Florence, Genoa, Milan, Naples, Rome, and Venice, American Protestant churches in Florence and Rome, and Scotch Presbyterian churches in Genoa, Naples, Rome, and Venice. The Germans in Italy have formed a number of congregations at various places. They maintain schools in Florence, Genoa, Messina, Milan, Naples, Palermo, and Rome, and hospitals in Florence, Genoa, Milan, Naples, and Rome. Since 1880 the German ministers in Italy have had their annual conference.

Perhaps the most flourishing Evangelical congregation in Italy is the Evangelical Military Association in Rome, which was founded by L. Capellini (d. 1898).

4. Benevolent Institutions.

Of other educational and charitable institutions under Evangelical control may be mentioned the high schools for girls in Florence and Naples; the Anglo-American Institute at Rome; the elementary schools of Miss Carruthers at Pisa, S. Michele degli Scalzi, and Cisanello di Ghezzano; Dr. Comandi's orphan asylum for boys at Florence; the Feretti orphan asylum for girls at Florence; the Gould Institute at Rome, an educational institution for boys and girls; the work-school for women at Turin; the Boyce Memorial Home at Vallecrosia, an asylum for orphans, both boys and girls; and the Evangelical Rescue-Mission of Mrs. Hammond in Venice.

5. Bible and Tract Societies.

There are three Bible societies working in Italy, viz., the Italian Bible Society, which was founded in Rome in 1871, the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the National Bible Society of Scotland. Since 1860 the British and Foreign Bible Society has distributed in Italy more than 3,000,000 Bibles and New Testaments. The Italian Tract Society, founded at Florence in 1855, has a printing-establishment at Florence and salesrooms in a dozen Italian cities. To this tract society the entire Protestant Church in Italy is indebted for the great bulk of its polemical and educational literature. This society also publishes *L'Italia Evangelica*, an illustrated family weekly; *L'Amico dei fanciulli*, an illustrated monthly for children; and *L'Amico di casa*, a popular calendar (annual edition, 35,000). Of less importance is the Baptist Tract Society in Turin.

6. Periodicals.

Other Evangelical periodicals are *La Rivista Christiana*, a scholarly monthly; *Le Témoin*, the weekly organ of the French-speaking Waldensians; *La Luce*, a Waldensian weekly; *Il Christiano*, the monthly organ of the Free Christian Church; *La Civiltà Evangelica*, a monthly published by the Wesleyans; *Il Piccolo Messaggiere*, the monthly of the Evangelical Italian Church; *L' Evangelista*, a weekly issued by the Methodists; *Il Testimonio*, a Baptist monthly; and *Il Labaro*, a monthly published by the Old Catholics. (K. RÖNNEKE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The official Roman Catholic record is given in the annual, *Gerarchia cattolica.* More general works are: C. Hemans, *Catholic Italy*, 2 vols., Florence, 1861; J. H. Eager, *Romanism in its Home*, Philadelphia, 1899; A. Robertson, *The Roman Catholic Church in Italy*, London, 1903. On the Old Catholic movement in general consult: A. M. Scarth, *Story of the Old Catholic and Kindred Movements*, London, 1869; C. J. Loyson, *Catholic Reform*, ib. 1874; F. Meyrick, *The Old Catholic Movement*, ib. 1877. On Protestantism in general consult: R. Baird, *Sketches of Protestantism in Italy*, Boston, 1847; J. A. Wylie, *The Awakening of Italy*, London, 1866; H. H. Farrell, *Italy Struggling into Light*, Cincinnati, 1880; J. Stoughton, *Footprints of Italian Reformers*, London, 1881; J. W. Brown, *An Italian Campaign*, ib. 1890 (the Evangelical movement 1845–1887); E. Gebhardt, *L'Italie mystique*, Paris, 1890; A. R. Pennington, *The Church in Italy*, London, 1895; G. B. Taylor, *Italy and the Italians*, Philadelphia, 1898. On the Free Churches consult the Reports of the General Assembly, usually published under the titles *Verbali della . . . Assemblea Generale della Chiese Cristiane in Italia; The Free Christian Church in Italy, Evangelization Report*, Florence, 1874. For the Waldenses see the literature under WALDENSES.

ITALY, THE REFORMATION IN.

Two Periods (§ 1).
Venice (§ 2).
Naples (§ 3).
The Inquisition in Naples (§ 4).
In South and Central Italy (§ 5).
The Later Period in Venice (§ 6).
Italian Reformation Writings (§ 7).

1. Two Periods.

This article is concerned with the Reformation in Italy only in its general features. Its more important characters are treated in separate articles (see CARACCIOLI, GALEAZZO; CURIONE, CELIO SECONDO; MORATA, OLIMPIA; OCHINO, BERNARDINO; PALEARIO, AONIO; RENÉE OF FRANCE; SPIERA, FRANCESCO; VALDÉS; VERGERIO, PIETRO PAOLO; VERMIGLI, PIETRO MARTIRE). The first noteworthy traces of the Reformation in Italy appear in the north, at Venice, but the culmination was reached in the south, at Naples. The first and rising period lies between 1520, when writings of the German Reformation are first known to have crossed the Alps, and 1540 or 1541, the year marking the death of Valdés, who wrought in an elect circle at Naples, as the most strongly intellectual and original of the Italian Reformers. Almost simultaneously with the breaking-up of the Evangelical circle at Naples, there set in (1542) the deliberate and systematic reaction instigated from Rome; the bull of Paul III., *Licet ab initio* (see INQUISITION, II., § 1), by the terms of which the Inquisition was organized after the Spanish model, and extended over all Italy (Naples excepted), is the storm signal. With unremitting activity until about 1570, this tribunal, personally directed by the popes, utilizing the entire political influence of the Curia, accomplished its work by driving a number of the chief advocates of reform to flight, by dungeon and fire and water, and smothered the movement. What still remained in the way of Evangelical tendencies during the later years of this second period had become divested of all efforts at internal church reform and stands in deliberate, most trenchant, opposition to Rome, falling in with certain radical tendencies which manifested themselves in Germany, but particularly in the Netherlands, where the leaders of a conservative Evangelical reformation steadily resisted them with force.

2. Venice.

In Venice down to 1527 there is no evidence of repressive measures beyond repeated burning of reformatory writings of German origin; but toward the close of 1530 the papal nuncio, Caraffa (later Paul IV.), interposed against the "heretics" with greater strictness, and even sentenced a Franciscan, Girolamo Galateo (b. in Venice, 1490), to death without obtaining confirmation for the act from the Senate. They kept him in prison seven years, then set him free, but in 1540 arrested him again, and, broken by his earlier sufferings, he died in the year following. His "Apology," dedicated to the Senate, printed at Bologna in 1541, outlines a noteworthy plan of internal church reform, which betrays the influence of German doctrines, and on the question of free will, the sacraments, the veneration of saints, and other points is truly Biblical. In a report which Caraffa prepared for the Curia (printed in *Rivista Cristiana,* Florence, 1878), two other leading heretics are mentioned. Bartolomeo Fonzio was a Venetian, incurred suspension from the priestly office in 1529, escaped to Germany, and was present at Augsburg in 1530. He was in correspondence with Butzer in 1531. It was probably Fonzio, despite his subsequent denial, who translated Luther's tract *An den christlichen Adel* into Italian (cf. *ZKG,* iv., 1880, pp. 467 sqq.). Later he was again active in Italy, and in 1558 was arrested in Cittadella, not far from Venice; he was sentenced to death and drowned, for forty-four "erroneous doctrines," extracted from his writings. When Caraffa prepared his report, mentioned above, in 1532, there lived also at Venice the Florentine fugitive, Antonio Bruccioli, who rendered the movement of the Reformation great service by elucidating and printing Biblical writings in the Italian language. He was under suspicion, and so continued; and notwithstanding occasional retraction, he was repeatedly brought to trial. He died in prison in 1566. As in his case, so with others, such as Fra Baldo Lupetino of Albona in Istria, and Baldassare Altieri, of Aquila in Neapolitan territory, their religious development and its sequel belong both to the first and the second period of Italian Reformation history.

3. Naples.

Meanwhile the reforming doctrine had found its real and vital center in Italy, in the circle of Juan de Valdés at Naples. The biographer of Caraffa (*Caraccioli, Vita di Papa Paolo IV.,* MS. in British Museum) with good reason declares that Naples was the "nest of heresy"; but the tradition is false that would have it that the Lutheran belief was carried thither by German soldiers after the sack of Rome in 1527. From about 1536 onward a company is found there—scholars of Valdés, himself devoted to the fundamental doctrines of the German Reformation and influenced by mysticism—which includes the most important vehicles of the Italian Reformation: Bernardino Ochino, Pietro Martire Vermigli, Pietro Carnesacchi, Benedetto di Mantua (reviser of the little book "Of the Benefit of Christ's Death," probably by A. Palerio (q.v.); Eng. transl., London, reprint, 1855, also in W. M. Blackburn, *Aonio Palerio,* Philadelphia, 1866), Mario Galeata, Francesco d'Alvise of Caserta, Giovanni Bugio, Galeazzo Caraccioli, Marcantonio Flaminio, and others, who partly, it is true, never went beyond the attempt at a reform from within the Church. The central article about which all converge in the matter of doctrine is the tenet of justification by faith. Furthermore, it was immaterial to a Valdés what the external structure of the Church might be, provided it did not abridge this religious condition. He was far from intending to raise the standard of revolt against church institutions, and he was no organizer; his teachings found their way beyond the circumference whose center was marked by his ideal—pure character, illumined with profound piety—only by the accident that his writings were preserved as dear legacies by his friends. The chief service in this regard was rendered by the noblest of his pupils, Giulia Gonzaga, duchess of Traetto (see Valdés).

4. The Inquisition in Naples.

Among the pupils of Valdés who did not exceed the boundary of a reform attempted from within the Church was Marcantonio Flaminio of Imola, highly endowed as a poet; it was he who gave to the book "Of the Benefit of Christ's Death" the form under which, according to the testimony of Vergerio, it became circulated through the land in more than forty thousand copies, though today not a single library of Italy has one impression from that period. The first blows of the reaction, when it was introduced in 1542 through the reorganization of the Inquisition at Rome (see Inquisition), struck the two most eminent members of the circle surrounding Valdés, Ochino and Vermigli. Ochino was suspended from the preaching office; and he escaped, by flight, a summons to appear at Rome to give an account of himself. At the same time, Vermigli, who had risen to high rank in the order of the Augustinian canons, took to flight, whence he despatched to his doctrinal associates a testimonial of evangelistic faith in the guise of his *Semplice dichiaragione sopra i dodici articoli della fede cristiana.* Presently the reaction directed its attention to a third member of the Neapolitan circle; viz., Pietro Carnesecchi (b. in Florence 1508), who had held high stations under the Curia. After he had avoided the Inquisition during a sojourn of many years abroad and in Venice, he was brought to trial by Pope Paul IV., and escaped for the time, after having been summoned twice, through the pope's death, and the destruction of the documentary charges against Carnesecchi, on occasion of the storm upon the Inquisition's building in 1559. Pius V. retrieved the matter and Carnesecchi, whose correspondence with Giulia Gonzaga formed the basis of a second trial, was executed with other "heretics" on Oct. 1, 1567. Among the victims of the Inquisition, not a few were of Neapolitan origin; and they all belonged to the very great numbers whom the viceroy's complacency delivered, year in, year out, to the Curia, though the Spanish Inquisition was not allowed to operate in the kingdom proper, and an attempt to introduce it in 1547 had been frustrated by a sanguinary insurrection of the populace. The viceroy's complacent disposition was also proved at the death of Giulia Gonzaga in 1566, when he seized her correspondence and despatched it to Rome. By his long years of superintending the Inquisition Pius V. acquired the most exact acquaintance with the situation, and he renewed and intensified the tribunal's activity so that he won the name of Fra Michele dell' Inquisizione. A storm of persecution covered all parts of Italy in the years of his pontificate (1566–1572). Concerning the victims only defective information remains, but it put an end to the reforming movement.

5. In South and Central Italy.

With reference to the additional victims apprehended in the south, some information is given in Luigi Amabile's *Il santo offizio della inquisizione in Napoli* (2 vols., Città di Castello, 1892). Nothing short of wholesale murder was perpetrated in that quarter in 1560 and 1561 upon the Evangelical inhabitants of San Sisto and La Guardia. Moreover, the Holy Office's barge plied regularly back and forth between Naples and Ostia, incessantly bringing new "suspects" before the tribunal. The numbers of emigrants—or rather fugitives—for the faith from Sicily and the kingdom continually increased—so far, at least, as this item can be checked at Geneva, where many sought refuge (cf. J. Galiffe, *Le Refuge italien de Genève*, Geneva, 1881). For southern and central Italy, some acceptable information is furnished by a protocol-book of the Roman Inquisition for the years 1564–67, which contains the sentences decreed against heretics during that period (cf. *Revista Cristiana*, 1879–80). How matters looked and fared in the Roman Inquisition's prison is reported by the younger Camerarius, who was himself under arrest there, in 1565, whose *Relatio vera* was printed by J. G. Schelhorn (*De vita, fatis ac meritis Philippi Camerarii*, Nuremburg, 1749). Camerarius was confined in the upper story, "where one is in the bake-oven"; others were below, "in so damp a hole that it is past understanding how men can exist in that grave." Frequently monks came in to make attempts at conversion, Dominicans for the most part, once Petrus Canisius, the Jesuit. Among their fellow captives were spies. Camerarius and his fellow countryman, Peter Rieter, were liberated through the rigorous intercession of Emperor Maximilian II., to whom appeal had been made. On June 23, 1566, there was "public abjuration" of twenty-three who were under charge, who, for the most part, had been sentenced to perpetual confinement, or to the rigor of the galleys. After that, sentence was pronounced upon the Neapolitan nobleman, Pompeo de' Monti, who was beheaded near the bridge of Sant' Angelo, on July 4, 1566. Still other victims who were executed in Rome are named in the roll of Italian Reformation martyrs; three of them so early as under Julius III., Fanino of Faenza, Domenico of Bassano, and the Augustinian Giuliano; later, two others, Giovanni Buzio (also named Mollio), of Montalcino, and an unknown of Perugia; under Paul IV., the noble youth Pomponio Algieri of Nola was burned, and how many at that time were still confronted with a similar fate may be inferred from the fact that on the death of this pope in 1559, when the people's rage broke open the prison doors, no fewer than seventy heretics were set free.

6. The Later Period in Italy.

Better information exists as to what occurred from the beginning of the energetic reaction at Venice and in its dominion, than with reference to events and the scope of repression in southern and central Italy. At Venice, the outcome of the movement was connected with the general political situation, and the senate, from the time of the downfall of the Protestant party in Germany through the Schmalkald War, waived whatever considerations it had previously conceded to their wishes, and showed itself much more amenable to the Curia than was formerly the case. Meantime a new religious movement had sprung up in Venice. In 1550, Julius III. affirmed that 1,000 Venetians might be counted as belonging to the Anabaptist sect. A new group thus comes to the light, inasmuch as the earlier advocates of the Reformation belonged not to the radical, but to the conservative Reformation, as espoused by Luther. Both currents are in collateral progress from the middle of the century, and both command eminent names; but the attitude of mutual antagonism on the part of their champions contributed even more than the brute force of their common foe to nullify the movement itself. Among advocates of the conservative Reformation are to be named men such as Pietro Speziali (in Cittadella) and Francesco Spiera (q.v.). Now, too, the previously mentioned Fra Baldo Lupetino was seized by his fate; and only for a little while longer could Baldassare Altieri of Aquila, who had been in correspondence with Luther, Bullinger, and others, still work in the wake of the Schmalkald party's defeat after he was compelled to leave Venice in 1549. A transition to the steadily growing Anabaptist party is afforded by Francesco Negri of Bassano; in a measure, as well, by Celio Secondo Curione. The proper father, however, of the Italian Anabaptists was Camillo of Sicily, who, after his conversion, styled himself "Renato." His system is quite spiritualistic; whoever is elected receives the "spirit"; the children of the "spirit" merely slumber in death, to enter upon a higher form of being thereafter; the rest fall away to destruction. The sacraments are only emblems; Christ is above all a divinely favored man; and more of the same sort. Their theological foundations were fixed in a "council," organized, by sixty of their representatives, at Venice in 1550; though not, indeed, without the separation of a more moderate from the radical faction, so that henceforth there are three distinct groups, instead of two, as previously, of Protestantism in Italy. In the subsequent fate of the Anabaptist congregations, which became closely affiliated with the center of the moderate Anabaptist cause at Nikolsburg in Moravia, two brilliant martyr names are encountered in the period when the storm began to rage: Giulio Gherlandi and Francesco della Saga, who fell a sacrifice to the Venetian Inquisition in 1565. Among advocates of the Reformation in Venetian territory may lastly be named Bishop Pier Paolo Vergerio, because, according to his own acknowledgment, the truth of the Gospel indelibly impressed itself upon him at Padua, by the sick-bed of the unfortunate Spiera; and because the Inquisition at Venice subjected him to a tedious course of trial. This disputatious battler wielded an inexhaustible store of fresh weapons against the Roman Church out of the armory of his own experience and exact knowledge of the hierarchy; although he did not equal the men of the first generation in disinterested devotion to truth, in courage and joy of sacrifice. Neither can his writings be justly compared with the other products of the movement, as some of them are revealed in the *Biblioteca della Riforma Italiana* (6 vols., Florence, 1881–86).

7. Italian Reformation Writings.

Among the writings of the Italian Reformation, besides the invaluable yield of Juan de Valdés, the previously cited little book "Of the Benefit of Christ's Death" fills an honorable place. There may also be mentioned the fact that the *Sommario della Sacra Scrittura* was no less effective, although it was not Italian originally, but a recast Middle Low German (Dutch) work, dating from the decade 1520–30. A collection of the literature of the Reformation in Italy after the plan followed by E. Böhmer for the Spanish Reformation in the *Bibliotheca Wiffeniana* is much to be desired. Rich contributions toward the project would be supplied by the serial volumes of *Rivista Cristiana* from 1873; and a considerable portion of the original issues are to be found collected in the library accumulated by Count Piero Guicciardini, and made over to the national library of Florence. Long forgotten and concealed, hardly discoverable in their own country, these writings bear witness to the high mental significance of that minority which once existed in the land of the popes and fought under the banner of reform. K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best guide to the sources is K. Benrath, *Ueber die Quellen der italienischen Reformationsgeschichte*, Bonn, 1876; idem, in *ZKG*, i. 613–626, iv. 394–413. *Rivista cristiana*, a periodical published in Florence, 1873 sqq., contains much material of the first importance. Instructive hints as to sources are given in F. H. Reusch, *Der Index der verbotener Bücher*, i. 373 sqq., Bonn, 1883. Consult further: J. Bonnet, *Vie de Olympia Morata*, Paris, 1850, new ed., 1862, Eng. transl., London, 1852; idem, *Aonio Paleario*, Paris, 1862, Eng. transl., London, 1864; idem, *Récits du xvi. siècle*, Paris, 1864; idem, *Nouveaux* and *Derniers Récits*, ib. 1876; idem, many contributions to *Bulletin du protestantisme française;* D. Erdmann, *Die Reformation und ihre Märtyrer in Italien*, Berlin, 1855; J. Stoughton, *Footprints of Italian Reformers*, London, 1881; K. Benrath, *Geschichte der Reformation in Venedig*, Halle, 1887; idem, *Bernardino Ochino von Siena*, ib. 1892; B. Fontana, *Renata . . . di Ferrara*, 3 vols., Rome, 1889–1899; A. R. Pennington, *The Church in Italy*, London, 1895; E. Comba, *I nostri protestanti*, vol. ii., Florence (unfinished, deals only with Venice); A. Agostini, *Pietro Carnesecchi e il movimento Waldesiano*, ib. 1899; *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. ii., *The Reformation*, pp. 578–599, New York, 1904; E. H. Walshe, *Under the Inquisition; The Reformation in Italy*, London, 1904; C. Dejob, *La Foi religieuse en Italie au xiv. siècle*, Paris, 1906; C. von Klenze, *The Interpretation of Italy*, Chicago, 1907; and the literature under the articles on the Reformers named in the text.

ITHACIUS CLARUS. See PRISCILLIAN, PRISCILLIANISTS.

ITUREA: A region named in Luke iii. 1. The name of a people, "the Itureans," is older than "Iturea" as the name of a region, and is to be connected with the Jetur of Gen. xxv. 15, a son of Ishmael denoting a nomadic stock of the Syro-Arabian desert, whose home, according to the Genesis passage, was in the neighborhood of Teima on the western border of Najd, between Medina and the oasis of Jauf. I Chron. v. 18–22 tells of a victorious campaign of the Hebrews of the East-Jordan land against Jetur and other nomads in pre-exilic times, which shows that Jetur must have changed its place of abode to the neighborhood of the Jabbok; but the mention in Luke iii. 1 can have nothing to do with this passage. Aristobulus I. (105–104 B.C.) fought the Itureans and annexed part of their territory (Josephus, *Ant.* XIII., xi. 3), and Strabo (XVI., ii. 10, 18) in Roman times locates them on the plain of Massyas (Marsyas) between Laodicea and Chalcis, i.e., in Cœle-Syria (q.v.), and he is corroborated by an inscription of Quirinius (Mommsen in *Ephemeris epigraphica*, iv. 537–542, Berlin, 1881). It is to be concluded therefore that Jetur and the Itureans are the same stock, and that they came north with the migrations of the Arab tribes, settled down, and adopted the manners of the people of the region.

Iturea as the name of a region is connected with this last phase of the people's history. The first ruler of whom mention is made is Ptolemy, son of Menneus, who reigned 85–40 B.C., and had a kingdom of considerable size, including some cities on the coast, and the region about the sources of the Jordan as far east as the neighborhood of Damascus (Josephus, *Ant.* XIII., xvi. 3). This Ptolemy paid Pompey 1,000 talents in order to make his rule secure with the Romans (Josephus, *Ant.* XIV., iii. 2), and he protected the last of the Hasmoneans. His son Lysanias is called king of the Itureans by Dio Cassius, and was executed by order of Antony, 36 B.C. (Josephus, *Ant.* XV., iv. 1). Later there were only remnants of the great Iturean kingdom, with Chalcis as the capital, one of which was Abilene, ruled by the tetrarch Lysanias (Luke iii. 1); another was the region of Soëmus, north of Heliopolis; still another was the region of Chalcis, given by Claudius to Herod, grandson of Herod the Great; and finally the territory of Zenodorus, which came into the possession of Herod the Great (Josephus, *Ant.* XV., x. 1). After the death of Herod, Augustus joined a portion of the territory of Zenodorus to the territory of the tetrarch Philip (4 B.C.–34 A.D.), that part which included Batanea, Trachonitis, and Auranitis; thus Philip ruled a part of the Iturean territory, a fact which partly justifies the statement in Luke iii. 1. (H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, pp. 544 sqq., London, 1897; F. Münter, *De rebus Ituraeorum*, Copenhagen, 1824; M. Krenkel, *Josephus und Lukas*, pp. 90–95, Leipsic, 1894; Schürer, *Geschichte*, i. 707–725, Eng. transl., I., ii. 325–344; *DB*, ii. 521–522; *EB*, ii. 2296–2297.

IVERACH, iv′er-ūH, **JAMES:** United Free Presbyterian Church, Scotland; b. in Caithness June 1, 1839. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh (1859–63) and New College, Edinburgh (1863–67), and was ordained to the ministry in 1869. He held pastorates at West Calder, Edinburgh (1869–74), and Ferryhill, Aberdeen (1874–1887); was professor of apologetics and dogmatics in United Free Church College, Aberdeen (1887–1907), and principal (1905–07); and has been professor of New-Testament language and literature (since 1907). He has written *Life of Moses* (London, 1881); *Is God Knowable?* (1884); *St. Paul, his Life and Times* (1890); *Christianity and Evolution* (1894); *The Truth of Christianity* (1895); *Theism, in the Light of Present Science and Philosophy* (1900); *Descartes, Spinoza, and the New Philosophy* (1904); and *Other Side of Greatness, and Other Sermons* (1906).

IVES, aivz, **LEVI SILLIMAN:** Roman Catholic; b. at Meriden, Conn., Sept. 16, 1797; d. in New York Oct. 13, 1867. He served for about a year in the War of 1812 and subsequently studied at Hamilton College. He was originally a Presbyterian, but joined the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1819. After taking orders in 1822, he held charges at Batavia, N. Y., Philadelphia, and Lancaster, Pa., and in New York, till 1831, when he became bishop of North Carolina. He displayed great zeal and ability in the religious education of the slaves, but his Tractarian views brought him into serious difficulties. While in Rome in 1852 he formally submitted to the pope and became a Roman Catholic. The following October he was solemnly deposed from his episcopal office. On his return to New York he became professor of rhetoric in St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, N. Y., also lecturer on English literature and rhetoric in the Convent of the Sacred Heart. He was prominent in the charitable work of the Roman Catholic Church. He published *New Manual of Private Devotions* (New York, 1831); *The Apostles' Doctrine and Fellowship: Five Sermons* (1844); *On the Obedience of Faith* (1849); and *The Trials of a Mind in its Progress to Catholicism* (Boston, 1853; London, 1854).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 57, New York, 1895.

IVIMEY, JOSEPH: English Baptist historian; b. at Ringwood (17 m. w.s.w. of Southampton) May 22, 1773; d. in London Feb. 8, 1834. In early life he followed his father's trade, that of a tailor, at Lymington and Portsea; became a church-member in 1790, an itinerant minister in 1794, assistant minister at Wallingford, Berkshire, in 1803; and pastor of the Baptist church in Eagle Street, Holborn, London, in 1805. He was a pronounced opponent of Roman Catholicism, and so denounced the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts; he was also interested in the abolition of slavery and in missionary operations. His chief significance is as historian of his denomination, by his *History of the English Baptists* (4 vols., London, 1834), which, however, is criticized as to be used with caution on account of its mistakes. He wrote on other subjects quite voluminously, his works including *Brief Sketch of the History of Dissenters* (1810), and *John Milton, his Life and Times* (1833).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. Pritchard, *Memoir of the Life and Writings of . . . Joseph Ivimey*, London, 1835; *DNB*, xxix. 81–82.

IVO, ī″vō′, **OF CHARTRES (IVO** or **YVO CARNOTENSIS):** Bishop of Chartres (47 m. s.w. of Paris); b. in the district of Beauvais c. 1040; d. Dec. 23, 1116. He studied under Lanfranc at Bec, became a canon at Nesle in Picardy, then provost of the abbey of St. Quentin in Beauvais c. 1078, and bishop of Chartres in 1090. As the bishop before him had been deposed for simony, and commanded some support, Ivo's election was contested; but his cause was espoused by Pope Urban II., who had given him consecration. The same pope protected him when subjected to arrest by King Philip I. of France, because Ivo had not acquiesced in the repudiation of Queen Bertha, and the king's liaison with Countess Bertrada of Anjou. In the investiture strife (see INVESTITURE), Ivo took a stand of sagacious mediation between the rights of the State and the Church (cf. his *Epist. ad Hugonem archiepiscopum Lugdunensem* in *MGH*, *Lib. de lite*, ii., 1893, pp. 642, 649, and his letter of 1106 to Pope Paschal II. in *MPL*, clxii. 19). When subsequently Paschal II. was sharply attacked for his attitude to Emperor Henry V., in the year 1111, Ivo vindicated him, and frustrated the design of Archbishop Joscerannus of Lyons, who aimed to have Paschal's concessions to Henry adjudged heretical by means of a great French council (*MGH*, ut sup., pp. 649 sqq.). Ivo was highly esteemed in France, and was also on friendly terms with Anselm of Canterbury. The date of his canonization is uncertain; his day is May 20.

The most important among Ivo's writings are his collections of canons, wherein he anticipated Gratian, the *Collectio tripartita*, the *Decretum*, and the *Panormia*. Both as reflecting his own life and as bearing upon the history of his time, his letters are of weight; and there are also twenty-four of his sermons preserved, some of which are detailed treatises on dogmatic and liturgical questions. He also wrote against Berengar of Tours. Certain historical works of his friend, Hugo of Fleury, have been attributed to him erroneously. CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The works, first printed Paris, 1647, are reprinted with a life in *MPL*, clxi.–clxii. Consult: A. Abry, *Yves de Chartres, sa vie et ses ouvrages*, Strasburg, 1841; F. Ritzke, *De Ivone, episcopo Carnotensi*, Wratislaw, 1863; J. Dombrowski, *Ivo, Bischof von Chartres, sein Leben und Wirken*, Breslau, 1881; A. Sieber, *Bischof Ivo von Chartres*, Königsberg, 1895; R. von Scherer, *Handbuch des Kirchenrechts*, vol. i., 53, Graz, 1886; C. Mirbt, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII.*, pp. 512 sqq., Leipsic, 1894; F. Fournier, *Les Collections canoniques attribuées à Yves de Chartres*, in *Bibliothèque de l'école des Chartres*, vols. lvii.–lviii., 1896–97; idem, *Yves de Chartres et le droit canonique*, in *Revue des questions historiques*, lxvii., 1898; Hauck, *KD*, iii. 862, 904, 914; and literature indicated in Richardson, *Encyclopædia*, p. 515.

J

J: The symbol employed to designate the Jehovistic (Yahwistic, Judean) document which, according to the critical school, is one of the components of the Hexateuch (q.v.). See Hebrew Language and Literature, II., § 4.

JABAL. See Cain, Kenites.

JABIN, jê′bin: A Canaanitic king who appears in two narratives in the Old Testament (Josh. xi. 1–15, and Judges iv. 1 sqq.). In the first he appears as overlord of the Canaanitic kings of the region of Mt. Naphtali, with his capital at Hazor, and as conquered by Joshua at the "waters of Merom." This narrative purports to give the account of the conquest of northern Canaan as Josh. x. to give that of the south. In Judges iv. the history of Jabin is peculiarly bound up with that of Sisera in the narrative of Deborah and Barak's campaign. Verses 2 and 7 make Sisera Jabin's general, though in the song in chap. v. Sisera is king and in command of kings. Similarly in iv. 12–22 Sisera is the chief personage, while Jabin hardly appears, verse 17b being an editorial addition, so that the narrative concerning Sisera is in chap. iv. the basis of the story. Two hypotheses have been held concerning this Jabin: that the two accounts refer to different persons, and that they refer to the same person. Judges iv. still retains a trace of the correct tradition that after the time of Joshua a war was conducted against Jabin, king of Hazor.

(H. Guthe.)

Bibliography: Besides H. Guthe, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, pp. 51–52, Freiburg, 1899; *DB*, ii. 524; *EB*, ii. 2302–03, 2636–37; and C. F. Kent, *Student's Old Testament*, vol. i., 1904, the commentaries on Joshua and Judges should be consulted, particularly those on Judges by Budde and Moore, and the works on the history of Israel, especially those of Ewald, Kittel, and Wellhausen.

JABLONSKI, yū-blən′skî, **DANIEL ERNST**: Bishop of the Moravians; b. at Nassenhuben, near Danzig, Nov. 20, 1660; d. at Berlin May 25, 1741. He was educated at the gymnasium of Lissa and studied theology at Frankfort-on-the-Oder and at Oxford. In 1683 he was appointed Reformed preacher in Magdeburg, and in 1686 became pastor of the Polish congregation and rector of the gymnasium at Lissa. In 1691 he went to Prussia and became court preacher at Königsberg; but he always remained faithful to the Moravians in their exile and used his political influence to assist them in every way. At the synod of Lissa in 1699 he was chosen senior of the Unity and received their episcopal ordination. In 1737 he consecrated Count Zinzendorf bishop, and thus he formed the transition from the old stock of the Moravian Brethren to the younger branch of the Herrnhuters. His influence upon the development of the Prussian state is still more important. Since Sigismund of Brandenburg had adopted the Reformed creed (1613; see Sigismund, Johann), a union of the evangelical denominations had become a necessity for the Hohenzollerns, and Jablonski was the man to give this tendency a concrete form and a theological basis. Similar efforts were made at the court of Hanover by Leibnitz and by Molanus (qq.v.). Anthony Ulrich of Brunswick and the court of Gotha also sympathized with these unionistic movements. In the meantime Jablonski had become court preacher at Berlin (1697), and as Brandenburg was being transformed about this time into the state of Prussia, he considered it his mission to unite all Protestants under the leadership of Prussia. He entered into negotiations with Leibnitz and Molanus, but the undertaking failed on account of the opposition of the clergy. Another ideal which Jablonski tried to realize was the introduction of the episcopate into the Evangelical Church, which met a response in King Frederick's appointment of his court preacher's bishops. But failure resulted in 1713 when Frederick William I. ascended the throne. Against the demoralization of church life Jablonski attempted to introduce ethical societies after the model of the English societies for the reformation of manners. The Berlin Academy of Sciences owes its existence to his advocacy with that of Leibnitz. Jablonski was its first vice-president and director of the philologico-historical class, and in 1733 he became its president. His literary activity was not less important. He made a careful edition of the Old-Testament text which J. H. Michaelis adopted as the basis of his well-known *Kommentarbibel* (1720); at Jablonski's instigation the Berlin edition of the Babylonian Talmud was printed. He translated Bentley's *Confutation of Atheism* into Latin (Berlin, 1696); his *Historia consensus Sendomiriensis* (Berlin, 1731) is important in the sphere of church history, likewise his *Jura et libertates dissidentium in regno Poloniae* (1708). (P. Kleinert.)

Bibliography: J. E. Kapp, *Sammlung vertrauter Briefe des Freiherrn von Leibnitz und Hofpredigers Jablonski*, Leipsic, 1747; C. W. Hering, *Geschichte der kirchliche Unionsversuche*, ii. 313 sqq., ib. 1838; G. E. Guhrauer, *G. W. Freiherr von Leibnitz*, ii. 177 sqq., Breslau, 1846; A. L. Richter, *Geschichte der evangelischen Kirchenverfassung in Deutschland*, Leipsic, 1851; F. Brandes, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Politik des Hauses Brandenburg*, vol. i., Gotha, 1872; A. Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, iii. 302 sqq., Bonn, 1886; J. Kvacala, *Fünfzig Jahre im preussischen Hofpredigerdienste*, Dorpat, 1896; idem, *Neue Beiträge zum Briefwechsel zwischen D. E. Jablonski und G. W. Leibnitz*, ib. 1899.

JACKSON, FREDERICK JOHN FOAKES: Church of England; b. at Ipswich (18 m. s.e. of Bury St. Edmunds), Suffolk, Aug. 10, 1855. He was educated at Eton and at Trinity College, Cambridge (B.A., 1879), and was curate of Ottershaw, Winchester (1879–81), St. Giles, Cambridge (1882–84), and St. Botolph's, Cambridge (1884–91). He was appointed lecturer on divinity in Jesus College, Cambridge, was elected fellow in 1886, and made dean in 1895 and tutor in the following year. Since 1897 he has been examining chaplain to the bishop of Peterborough, since 1901 honorary canon of Peterborough cathedral, and was Hulsean lecturer in 1902. Theologically he is an orthodox member of the Church of England, and heartily accepts her dogmatic teachings. He has written *History of the Christian Church* (London, 1891); *Biblical History of the Hebrews* (Cambridge, 1903);

and *Christian Difficulties in the Second and Twentieth Centuries* (Hulsean lectures for 1902; London, 1903).

JACKSON, GEORGE ANSON: Congregationalist; b. at North Adams, Mass., Mar. 17, 1846; d. at Swampscott, Mass., May 8, 1907. He was graduated from Yale (Ph.B., 1868) and Andover Theological Seminary (1871); was pastor at Leavenworth, Kan. (1871–73), Southbridge, Mass. (1873–78), and Swampscott, Mass. (1878–97), and librarian of the General Theological Library, Boston, after 1897. He wrote: *The Christian Faith* (Boston, 1875); *The Apostolic Fathers* (New York, 1879); *Fathers of the Third Century* (1881); *Post-Nicene Greek Fathers* (1883); and *Post-Nicene Latin Fathers* (1883).

JACKSON, SHELDON: Presbyterian; b. at Minaville, N. Y., May 18, 1834; d. at Asheville, N. C., May 2, 1909. He was graduated at Union College in 1855, and Princeton Theological Seminary in 1858. He was a colporteur of the Presbyterian Board of Publication in 1856, and agent of the American Systematic Beneficence Society in 1857. In 1858 he was ordained to the Presbyterian ministry, and in the same year was appointed missionary to the Choctaw Indians at Spencer Academy, I. T. From 1859 to 1869 he was a missionary in western Wisconsin and southern Minnesota, being also pastor at La Crescent, Minn., from 1859 to 1863, and an agent of the United States Christian Commission to the Army of the Cumberland for three months in 1863, as well as associate pastor with George Ainslee at Rochester, Minn., and principal and professor of higher mathematics at Rochester Female Institute from 1864 to 1869. Throughout this time he itinerated constantly, and in these ten years organized over twenty churches. He declined the superintendency of Presbyterian missions in Minnesota in 1864, but in 1869 he accepted an appointment as superintendent of Presbyterian missions for northern and western Iowa, Nebraska, Dakota, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, and Utah. Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, eastern Nevada, and Alaska were later added to his district, thus giving him Presbyterian supervision over nearly half the territorial area of the United States at that time. It was largely through his efforts that the Woman's Board of Home Missions was organized in 1878. In 1879 and 1880 he was commissioned by the Government to collect Indian children from the Pueblo, Apache, Pima, and Papago tribes for education in the Indian Training Schools at Carlisle, Pa., and Hampton, Va.

After 1877 his main interests were connected with Alaska, and in 1879 he was commissioned by President Hayes, together with Rev. Dr. Henry Kendall, to prepare a special report on the native tribes of southeastern Alaska as a basis for legislation. Six years later he established the first canoe mail service in Alaska, and in the following year secured the enactment of a law giving limited territorial government, and providing for the establishment of public schools in the same territory. In 1885 he was appointed General Agent of Education in Alaska. In 1891 he began the successful introduction of Siberian reindeer into Alaska to provide the Eskimos with food, and in 1897 was a special agent of the United States Government in transporting a colony of Laplanders with their reindeer to Alaska. In 1897 he was commissioned by the Secretary of Agriculture to report on the agricultural possibilities of the Yukon River, and in 1899 established the first reindeer post-office routes in America.

He was a member of the executive committee of the International Sunday School Association since 1887, and in 1893 was appointed an advisory member of the religious congress held in connection with the Chicago World's Fair. He furnished exhibits of Alaskan ethnology to every national exposition from 1885 to 1905, and presented a valuable collection of ethnological material to Princeton Theological Seminary, which was later transferred to Princeton University. He was one of the founders of Westminster College at Salt Lake City. He edited the *Rocky Mountain Presbyterian* at Denver from 1872 to 1882, when he presented it to the Board of Home Missions and edited it in New York City as *The Presbyterian Home Missionary* from 1882 to 1885. He also edited the illustrated missionary monthly *North Star* at Sitka, Alaska, from 1887 to 1894. In addition to assisting in editing *The World's Best Orations* (11 vols., St. Louis, 1899) and *The World's Best Essays* (10 vols., 1900), he prepared for the United States Government twenty annual reports on education in Alaska since 1881 and fifteen on the introduction of domestic reindeer into Alaska since 1890, and wrote *Alaska and Missions on the North Pacific Coast* (New York, 1880).

Bibliography: R. L. Stewart, *Sheldon Jackson, Pathfinder and Prospector of the Missionary Vanguard in the Rocky Mountains and Alaska*, New York, 1908.

JACKSON, THOMAS: The name of two English theologians.

1. Church of England divine; b. at Witton-on-the-Wear (10 m. s.w. of Durham) Dec. 21, 1579; d. Sept. 21, 1640. He studied at Queen's and at Corpus Christi College, Oxford (B.A., 1599; M.A., 1603; B.D., 1610; D.D., 1622), where he was made probationer fellow in 1606 and subsequently repeatedly elected vice-president of Corpus Christi. At Oxford he won a reputation for his theological learning and delivered weekly lectures on theology both at Corpus Christi and at Pembroke. In 1623 he was instituted to the living of St. Nicholas, Newcastle-on-Tyne, and in 1625 he was presented to the living of Winston, Durham, which he held with Newcastle. About the same time he was made a royal chaplain. In 1630 he became president of Corpus Christi, a post which he filled till his death. In 1632 he was presented to the crown living of Witney, Oxfordshire, which he resigned in 1637. He became prebendary of Winchester in 1635, and dean of Peterborough in 1639. He was originally a Calvinist of Puritan leanings, but later became an Arminian. He ranks high as a theologian, and his theology has particularly commended itself to modern High-churchmen. His great work was his *Commentaries on the Apostles' Creed* (12 bks., London, 1613–57), of which books ten and eleven were edited by Barnabas Oley. Book twelve first appeared in complete form in Jackson's *Works* (3 vols., 1672–73). Jackson also published three collections of sermons, *Nazareth and Bethlehem* (Oxford, 1617); *Christ's Answer unto John's Question* (London, 1625); and *Diverse Sermons* (Oxford, 1637). His *Theological Works*, with the Life of Jackson by Edmund Vaughan, have been reprinted at Oxford (12 vols., 1844).

Bibliography: A. à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, ii. 664, and *Fasti*, i. 281, 299, 339, 401, 4 vols., London, 1813–20; *DNB*, xxix. 107–108 (where notices of scattered references are given).

2. English Wesleyan; b. at Sancton, near Market Weighton (18 m. e.s.e. of York), Yorkshire, Dec. 12, 1783; d. at Shepherd's Bush, London, Mar. 10, 1873. He joined the Methodist Society in 1801, his education having been attained through reading. From 1804 till 1824 he was an itinerant in the Wesleyan connection, occupying important circuits. He was editor of the connectional magazines, 1824–42, and professor of divinity in the Theological College at Richmond, Surrey, 1842–61. His more important works are: *The Life of John Goodwin* (London, 1822); *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Rev. Richard Watson* (1834); *The Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism* (1839); *The Life of the Rev. Charles Wesley* (2 vols., 1841); *The Life of the Rev. Robert Newton* (1855); *The Institutions of Christianity* (1868); and *Recollections of My Own Life and Times* (ed. B. Frankland, 1873). Jackson also edited numerous works, including *The Works of the Rev. John Wesley* (14 vols., 1829–31); *A Library of Christian Biography* (12 vols., 1837–40); *The Lives of the Early Methodist Preachers* (3 vols., 1837–1838; 3d ed., 6 vols., 1865–66); *Anthony Farindon's Sermons* (4 vols., 1849); and *The Journal of the Rev. Charles Wesley* (2 vols., 1849).

Bibliography: Consult, besides the *Recollections*, ut sup., *DNB*, xxix. 108–109.

JACOB (or ISRAEL), THE PATRIARCH.

The Names and Their Meaning (§ 1).
Jacob's Youth (§ 2).
His Life in Haran (§ 3).
His Later Life (§ 4).
Characteristics of the Sources (§ 5).
Jacob's Character (§ 6).
Historicity of the Narratives (§ 7).

1. The Names and Their Meaning.

Jacob, or Israel, the son of Isaac, was the ancestor who gave his name to the covenant people. Jacob means "one who holds the heel" or "one who treads on the heel" (Gen. xxv. 26), and is also explained as "one who overreaches" (cf. Jer. ix. 4) by means of his practised cunning (Gen. xxvii. 36). Israel, on the other hand, which became the designation of the people, was given him by God as a special distinction after he had proved his courage and gained a victory (Gen. xxxii. 28). Jacob is probably an abbreviation of Jacob-el, for, among the Palestinian towns captured by Thothmes III. and mentioned in his inscriptions at Karnak, names appear which may be recognized as *Yaʻḳobh-el* and *Yoseph-el*, a conclusion all the more probable since the name *Yaʻḳubh-ilu* appears in Babylonian contract-tablets. The inference usually drawn from this inscription that in the sixteenth century the Jacob or Joseph tribes were already established in Canaan is over-hasty, since the analogy of the other names indicates rather that communities are meant. Bäthgen explains Jacob-el as "El recompenses"; an alternative is "El wrestles" (Gen. xxxii. 24 sqq.).

2. Jacob's Youth.

Jacob's youth was one untiring effort to secure for himself the birthright which belonged to his twin-brother Esau. This struggle had even a prenatal origin (Gen. xxv. 22–23). In contrast with the coarse and violent Esau, Jacob was quiet and peaceable (Gen. xxv. 27), but shrewd, and able to use cleverly the weaknesses of his more sensuous brother (verse 29). In this he was aided by his mother, while the hunter found favor in the eyes of his father. Isaac, deceived by his wife, unwittingly bestowed the blessings of birthright upon Jacob (Gen. xxvii.; see Isaac), who in consequence was forced to abandon for a time the land of promise, and transferred his abode to Haran, the native land of his mother. In the course of his wanderings Jacob came to Bethel, where Yahweh appeared to him in a dream.

3. His Life in Haran.

The second period of Jacob's life was passed with his kindred in Haran, where he founded his house. He asked of Laban as a reward for seven years' labor the hand of his beautiful daughter, Rachel; but her sister Leah was substituted by the mercenary father, and Jacob was forced to serve seven years longer to gain his beloved Rachel. The latter, however, was unfruitful, while Leah brought him four sons: Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah. As a result of a substitution of slaves for their mistresses, Jacob's family was further increased by four sons, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, and Asher. These were followed by two sons of Leah, Issachar and Zebulun. At last Rachel bore her husband's favorite son, Joseph. As God's blessing seemed to be attached to Jacob's person, Laban was loath to lose his services; to his own disadvantage, however, for although the recompense which Jacob required might seem small, it always turned out to be unexpectedly large, and though Laban frequently changed the conditions (Gen. xxxi. 7), the advantage was always with Jacob. The tense relations between them hastened Jacob's secret departure with his wives and goods. Laban pursued and overtook him at the mount of Gilead, but, although embittered by the loss of his household gods, which Rachel had carried off without her husband's knowledge, he was forced to settle the strife amicably. The name Gilead (explained as *Galʻedh*, "hill of witness," Gen. xxxi. 48) was from this time a reminder of the treaty thus concluded.

4. His Later Life.

A third phase of Jacob's history began with his reentrance into the promised land and his settlement in the heart of the country. But first an understanding with Esau was necessary, and then to take possession of the disputed heritage, for which a severe struggle was required. Jacob succeeded by the help of spiritual powers (Gen. xxxii. 24 sqq.). After such a victory no human being could do him harm. The dreaded Esau received him kindly and retired again to the desert land of the Edomites, while Jacob established himself in Shechem, with whose inhabitants, however, his sons became involved in bloody quarrels. This induced Jacob to depart at first toward Bethel, where he made drink-offerings, according to his vow, where also the Lord appeared to him and gave him the covenant blessings. On their further journey, the last stage of which was Hebron, Rachel bore Benjamin and died in giving him birth. In Hebron Isaac, who died at an advanced age, was buried by Jacob and Esau. After residing for some time in Hebron, while his sons, with their flocks, wandered through the land north of Shechem, Jacob, in his old age, transferred his abode to Egypt, where his son Joseph (q.v.) had attained great honors. In Beersheba the patriarch received a last favorable message from his God (Gen. xlvi. 1 sqq.). In Egypt he was received with favor by the Pharaoh, and lived in Goshen (according to Gen. xlvii. 28, P) for seventeen years, dying at the age of 147. He was embalmed after the Egyptian method, and brought to the family tomb and buried there by his children.

5. Characteristics of the Sources.

The three sources, J, E, and P, appear in the part of Genesis which contains the Jacob narratives, to which P contributed the least. J and E do not always easily separate, since they followed practically the same traditions; but in J the cunning of Jacob seems the motive of action, while in E miraculous interpositions and appearances in dreams are more common. In JE the hatred of Esau because of his exclusion from his father's blessing is given as the cause of Jacob's emigration to Haran; in P the reason assigned is dissatisfaction on the part of his parents with the Hittite marriages of Esau (xxvii. 46–xxviii. 9). The two blessings, xxvii. 27 sqq. (JE) and xxviii. 3 (P), are independent, as are the accounts of Esau's departure to Seir, xxxvi. 6–7 (P) and xxxii. 3 sqq. (JE), and of the time of the change of name, xxxii. 28 (J) and xxxv. 10 (P). These divergences show that independent traditions were transmitted which are followed by the different sources. The chronology of Jacob's life, derived mostly from P, offers some difficulties. Thus, if from the 130 years of xlvii. 9 (Jacob's age when presented to Pharaoh) be deducted the seven fruitful and two unfruitful years, the thirty years of Joseph when the fruitful years began (xli. 46) and the fourteen years passed by Jacob in Haran before Joseph's birth, it would appear that when he left his father's house he was about seventy-seven years of age, though chaps. xxviii. sqq. evidently regard him as a young man. The three elements of the patriarchal blessing in xlviii.–xlix. combine supplementary details: xlvii. 3–6 is assigned to P, xlviii. 15–16, 20–22 to E, and xlix. to J. The post-Mosaic authorship assigned to xlix. (time of Samson by Bleek and Ewald, time of David by Knobel, much later than this by Stade) does not take account of the way in which the Levites are treated.

6. Jacob's Character.

Jacob's character is best illustrated by his double name. He is called Jacob because of his dexterity and cunning, which always give him the advantage over the physically stronger Esau and over the shrewd Laban. On account of his weakness and his subordinate position Jacob accommodates himself to the will of the stronger, yet always succeeds in attaining his end by courage and tenacity. However much dissimulation there was in his conduct, Jacob did not employ it for sordid gain. As Israel he strives for the blessing of God because he has recognized therein the highest good. He devotes his whole energy to obtaining the blessings of the covenant (Hos. xii. 4–5). It is true that Jacob's character does not show the comparative straightforwardness of Abraham, and therefore he can not be regarded as a model for all time. He is not an ideal, even according to the standard of Israelitic ethics, but a man whose sinful nature struggles against his better self; but he was purified by the suffering which made his life a sadder one than that of his forefathers (xlvii. 9). What raises Jacob above himself is his reverent, indestructible longing for the salvation of his God, which after long struggles attains complete satisfaction.

7. Historicity of the Narratives.

Whether, and in what sense, Jacob is historical may be a subject of debate. The simplicity and the unconventional sincerity of these recitals speak in favor of genuine tradition rather than of heroic poetry. Some of the alleged facts would surely never have been invented in later times, as, for example, the contemporaneous marriage with two sisters (cf. Rev. xviii. 18), or the distinction awarded to Bethel and the sanctuary there which was such an object of aversion to the prophets of the eighth century. The attempt to derive the history of Jacob from nature-myths has proved a total failure. While, in general, only the episode on the Jabbok (Gen. xxxii.) is looked upon as a possible survival of this nature, Popper has undertaken to show that Jacob-Israel is the Asiatic Herakles-Melcarth Palaemon, i.e., the victoriously striving sun-god, and has vainly endeavored to bring all the details of the Biblical narrative into accord with this myth. More probable is the hypothesis of an eponymous ancestor. In this way Ewald saw in Jacob a vigorous Hebrew people which had emigrated from Mesopotamia (cf. ARAM, ARAMEANS; Deut. xxvi. 5, R.V., margin), coalesced with those of the same race who had settled in Canaan at an earlier period, and then proceeded to dominate them, while elements of common ancestry (Esau), which had entered Canaan at an earlier period, gradually withdrew farther and farther toward the south. With the Aramean neighbors to the north, behind the mountains of Gilead (Laban), the tribe of Jacob had many clashes, which are described in the history of Laban. Stade considers that Israel was a tribe which lived on the Jabbok, and that their chief city was Mahanaim; Jacob, on the other hand, was a tribe of the country west of the Jordan, which lived in the neighborhood of Bethel. According to him Rachel, Leah, Isaac, Joseph, and his brothers were so many different clans, while the combination of two tribes was represented as a marriage, etc. According to the dominant opinion, later conditions are reflected in the stories of the patriarchs. Wellhausen believes that the popular recitals in regard to Jacob and Esau must have taken form in the earlier period of the kingdom of Israel, after the subjugation of Edom. For Bernstein, the patriarch Jacob and his history were invented after the separation of the kingdom in order to glorify Bethel; and Seinecke even sees in the despondency of the returning Jacob a reflex of the fear of the exiles on their return from Babylon, and in the treatment of the Shechemites by Simeon and Levi (xxxiv.) the reproof of the Samaritans by Ezra. Apart from such fancies, it would never be possible to transform the natural and characteristic figures of an Abraham or a Jacob into national experiences or the disappointments of a tribe. Mere invention being out of the question, the alternative is to assume that the stories deal with real persons. Names such as Jacob-el and Isra-el, which include the name of a divinity, should be regarded, like the name of Abraham, as originally individual rather than ethnic. In this way Kittel, Klostermann, and Ewald have looked upon the bearers of these names as chiefs who stood at the head of nomadic tribes. In the traditions of that far-away time only a few prominent personalities stand out, while the tribe which accompanied them in their wanderings appears only in details of the narrative. The historical standard used in reference to later periods may not be applied to primitive traditions; but, just as little should their essentially historical character be denied as being, in the main, faithful pictures of the time of the first residence of the fathers in the land of promise. C. von Orelli.

Bibliography: J. A. Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, i. 942–943, Königsberg, 1711; C. von Lengerke, *Kenaan*, pp. 290 sqq., ib. 1844; L. Diestel, *Der Segen Jakobs*, Brunswick, 1853; H. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, i. 412 sqq., 489 sqq., Hanover, 1864, Eng. transl., i. 341–362, London, 1883; K. Kohler, *Der Segen Jakobs*, Berlin, 1867; A. N. Obbard, *The Prophecy of Jacob*, Cambridge, 1867; A. Bernstein, *Ursprung der Sagen von . . . Jakob*, Berlin, 1871; J. Hamburger, *Real-Encyklopädie des Judenthums*, i. 543 sqq., Neustrelitz, 1874; A. Köhler, *Biblische Geschichte Altes Testamentes*, i. 136 sqq., Erlangen, 1875; L. Seinecke, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, i. 40 sqq., Göttingen, 1876; J. Popper, *Ursprung des Monotheismus*, pp. 346 sqq., Berlin, 1879; C. von Orelli, *O. T. Prophecy*, Edinburgh, 1885; R. Kittel, *Geschichte der Hebräer*, i. 122 sqq., Gotha, 1892, Eng. transl., London, 1895; W. Staerk, *Studien zur Religions- und Sprachgeschichte des A. T.*, i. 77–83, ii. 1–13, Berlin, 1899; C. A. Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, New York, 1902; *DB*, ii. 526–535; *EB*, ii. 2306–12; *JE*, vii. 19–24, and in general the works on the history of Israel as given under Ahab.

JACOB (JACOBUS) BARADÆUS or ZANZALUS. See Jacobites.

Relations Between City and Bishop.

JACOB CHRISTOPH AND THE COUNTER-REFORMATION IN SWITZERLAND: The Counter-Reformation found centers in Switzerland at Lucerne (see Cysat, Renward), and, somewhat later in the bishopric of Basel. The more difficult task presented itself in Basel, since here the issue was not merely to restore Romanism in a district already half conquered by the Calvinists; there was also a political conflict with the city of Basel, still striving after complete independence and extension of its boundaries. The rights of bishop and municipality often conflicted even before the Reformation; within the episcopal domain, in the modern Bernese Jura, the city possessed sovereign rights at a good many places; the bishop, on the other hand, was not only the spiritual lord of the city, but was endowed with comprehensive rights of sovereignty, being empowered to nominate mayor and council, and the city was pledged to pay him various taxes and the temporal domain of the diocese extended up to the city gates. Before the ecclesiastical agitation, the city of Basel was striving to enlarge its possessions at the expense of the bishopric and of the episcopal rights. In 1521 the municipality, without opposition, relegated all rights of the bishop to the nomination of mayor and council. The introduction of the Reformation dissolved, in 1529, the last bond between bishop and city, and the chapter moved over to Freiburg im Breisgau. In a treaty with the city, in 1530, Bishop Philip of Gundelsheim (1527–53) permitted the exercise of the new doctrine in certain districts of the diocese. The total dissolution of the bishopric appeared now to be merely a question of time. The city pursued its goal quietly but persistently; more and more parishes were united with it in various ways, but without assuring the status of the Reformation within the diocese; the bishopric was imperial soil, and the religious peace of 1555 expressly excluded the adherents of Zwingli.

Jacob Christoph Introduces the Counter-Reformation.

From 1560 a more vigorous church life was astir in Switzerland on the Roman Catholic side; following Borromeo's visit to St. Gall, Einsiedeln, and Luzerne in 1571, the Counter-Reformation distinctly begins to be perceptible in the original cantons, and even the neglected diocese of Basel was reached. On the death of Bishop Melchior, in 1575, the time of compliance came to a close. At the ensuing election, the youngest of the canons, Jacob Christoph Blarer of Wartensee (b. 1542), with urgent admonitions, elicited from his colleagues the promise to labor to restore the right belief, and then became the electors' choice (June 22, 1575). It was no easy task that he set for himself; the bishopric was involved in debt and ecclesiastically in confusion, and the city unquestionably had the ascendancy. At first Jacob Christoph acted in a friendly manner toward the city, but he inquired into the patronal privileges of the diocese and their legal bases. Relations to the instigator and promoter of the Swiss Counter-Reformation became visible; it was Carlo Borromeo of whom Jacob Christoph requested synodical by-laws, and the decrees of the Council of Trent were proclaimed in the diocese. The decisive step which he ventured was the conclusion of a league with the Roman Catholic cantons of the confederacy, Sept., 1579. This league was a significant fact; the Roman Catholic districts of western Switzerland, Fribourg, and Soleure, until then isolated between Protestant districts, gained a territorial connection with these new allies; the passage to France, a matter of great importance for the Roman Catholic Swiss mercenaries, was thereby secured; and against the city of Basel and its demand for the conversion of the diocese to the Protestant cause stood henceforth the combined Roman Catholic federation. Indeed, the treaty of alliance was framed expressly for reciprocal protection in religious concerns, even against members of the confederacy, and for the recovery of apostate subjects; only the bishop was not to use force without the allies' consent. In 1580 he came out openly with his designs; he solemnly excommunicated the prominent adherents of the Reformation in Pruntrut, summoned the Protestant congregations of the diocese to return to the Roman Church, dismissed the Protestant preachers, reinstated Roman worship in certain places, and even preached himself, at the most endangered spots. The Jesuit Canisius devised a catechism for the bishopric; a synod, attended by two hundred priests, convened at Delsberg, in Apr., 1581, and conferred concerning a diocesan visitation, the reform of the hierarchy, synodical by-laws, and the revision of the liturgical books.

Settlement of the Contention Between City and Bishop.

The city of Basel and the Protestant cantons had not failed to remonstrate when the bishop's first steps to repress the new doctrine became known. In reply Jacob Christoph affirmed his rights. Disturbances in the districts affected by the bishop then moved the citizens of Basel to bring their grievances before the diet of the confederacy. A court of arbitration was accordingly appointed, which, in the course of two years' proceedings, brought about a solution of the contention, in 1585. Two treaties were concluded: the first secured to the city of Basel the cession of all episcopal claims to sovereignty, both in the city and in the Sissgau and certain neighboring districts, for 200,000 florins; on its part the city renounced all sovereignty rights within the diocese. The cathedral chapter, in compensation for its ancient rights in the city, was to receive an indemnity of 50,000 florins. In the second treaty it was provided that the patronal privileges between Basel and congregations of the diocese should indeed still nominally exist, but that no right of the bishop should be thereby infringed, and that the city should be forbidden to protect subjects against the bishop; in return, the bishop pledged himself to suffer the subjects of the city to adhere to their own religion, merely reserving to himself the right of reinstating Roman Catholic worship. Every one was to enjoy freedom of choice in religion, and neither side should injure the other.

Although both the cathedral chapter and the pope protested against these treaties, it nevertheless appeared that they indicated the only proper course of action. The cession of untenable rights and titles of possession made the bishop unlimited lord in his domain. The city lost its influence over episcopal subjects. The prosecution of church reform no longer encountered insurmountable opposition; everywhere in the diocese the Roman Church recovered firm ground, and the number of Protestants continually decreased. Although the treaty allowed the Evangelicals of Basel free exercise of religion, it soon appeared that the bishop, in virtue of his conceded right of instituting Roman Catholic worship collaterally with the Evangelical, possessed the means of gradually abolishing the latter. The Evangelical subjects were everywhere confronted with the bishop's Roman Catholic officials, from whom they could obtain justice only with difficulty. Though the Reformation maintained itself in most places to about 1595, it was nevertheless constantly decreasing, and at last quite vanished.

WALTER GOETZ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. Ochs, *Geschichte der Stadt und Landschaft Basel*, vl. vi., Berlin, 1829; J. Burckhardt, *Die Gegenreformation . . . am Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Basel, 1855; A. P. von Segesser, *Ludwig Pfyffer und seine Zeit*, vols. ii.–iii., Bern, 1880–82; L. Vautrey, *Hist. des évêques de Bale*, vol. ii., Einsiedeln, 1884.

JACOB (JAMES) OF EDESSA (Lat. *Jacobus Edessenus* or *Orrhoenus;* Syr. *Urhaya;* Arab. *al-Rahawi*): The most important of all Syriac writers with the exception of Bar Hebræus (see ABULFARAJ); b. at Indaba, near Antioch, c. 633; d. June 5, 708. The Syriac and Arabic names are derived from the older name for Edessa. He began his studies in a monastery near Kinnesrin and finished them in Alexandria. In 684 or 687 he became bishop of Edessa, but retired after four years; he was too severe for his clergy and burned the canons before the house of the patriarch as useless because not kept. For eleven years he lived as teacher of the monks in the monastery of Eusebona, and then for nine years in that of Telleda. On the death of Habib, his successor as bishop of Edessa, he was recalled, but died four months later while transporting his library to the city. Jacob belonged to the monophysitic branch of the Syrian Church, but is highly esteemed also by the Maronites. He was a "man of three tongues," a theologian, historian, philosopher, and grammarian—in many respects the Jerome of the Syrians. His numerous writings (see BIBLIOGRAPHY) are not yet all published.

E. NESTLE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The works of Jacob, not all published, include one of the earliest of Syriac grammars, the extant fragments ed. W. Wright, London, 1871, and A. Merx in *Historia artis grammaticae apud Syros*, Leipsic, 1871; grammatical tracts, ed. J. P. Martin, London, 1869, and G. Phillips, 2 parts, Edinburgh, 1869–70; Scholia on the Old and the New Testaments, ed. Phillips, London, 1864; an exegetical work on the Hexaemeron, ed. with transl., A. Hjelt, Helsingfors, 1892. On his transl. of the Categories and Analytics of Aristotle S. Schüler has a dissertation, Erlangen, 1897; on his correspondence, *Journal of Sacred Literature*, new series, x (1867), 430; *ZDMG*, xxiv (1870), 261, xxxii (1878), 465, 735; on the chronological canon, E. W. Brooks, in *ZDMG*, liii (1899), 261, 534, 550; on his translation of the Bible, Ugolini in *Oriens Christianus*, ii. 2; on his ecclesiastical canons, the Germ. transl. of C. Kayser, Leipsic, 1886. The *Carmen de fide contra Nestorium* is not his, nor the legend on the sons of Rechab. A. L. Frothingham, *The Existence of America Known early in the Christian Era*, in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, iv. 1888, interprets a passage in the Hexaemeron. Consult: J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, i. 468–494, Rome, 1719; W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac MSS.*, London, 1870–72; *DCB*, iii. 332–335 (quite full).

JACOB OF ELTZ AND THE COUNTER-REFORMATION IN TREVES: The Reformation nowhere gained firm footing in the archdiocese of Treves, and the principal work of the Counter-Reformation there was to renovate the ancient régime. To this task Archbishop Jacob III. of Eltz (1567–1581) applied himself. Born in 1510, of an old

Aggressive Measures.

family of Treves, he rose early to the rank of a prebendary of the cathedral and, in 1547, to that of dean of the chapter. After he was elected archbishop, Apr. 7, 1567, he sought to secure his position by forming alliances with the strictly Roman Catholic states; in 1569 he proposed a Catholic league with the Duke of Alva in Brussels; and when, in the same year, by inspiration from the court of Munich, negotiations began with a view to the extension of the Landsberg League, he was one of the most zealous advocates for the admission of Alva to this league. But, owing to opposition on the Protestant and imperial side, the extensive plans made resulted in no more than the accession to the league of the two electors of Treves and Mainz. Under such conditions the league could not be what had been hoped, and Jacob lost interest in it, although there still survived a close bond between him and the courts of Brussels and Munich, the two centers of the Roman Catholic policy in respect to the empire. He supported, as far as possible, the Bavarian hopes with reference to Cologne (see Gebhard II.), while both in advance of the imperial diets and pending their sessions he resisted every concession to the Protestants that overstepped the terms of the religious peace. In 1568 Roman Catholic worship was restored under the leadership of the Jesuit Tyraeus, in Neumagen, where the Count of Wittgenstein had procured an entrance for the new doctrines; and likewise the domain of the sometime imperial abbey of Prüm was cleansed of all heresy when, in 1576, it became incorporated with the electorate. In 1571 Jacob removed all non-Catholics from his court, a measure hitting mainly the nobility. In 1572 the order was issued that whoever desired to be received as citizen or inhabitant anywhere in the electorate must establish his Catholic faith. In 1577 the papal nuncio, Portia, could report that the electorate was free from all heresies. Jacob's further activity had to do with the reform of his own Church.

Reform of the Church.

At Easter, 1569, he was the first in Germany who solemnly swore to the decrees of Trent. Between Apr. and Oct., 1569, the council's decisions were announced in all parishes of the electorate. A liturgy elaborated by Jacob himself, with the assistance of certain Jesuits, was issued in 1574, as standard for worship, moral discipline, and matrimonial concerns. Portia's further counsels show why the previously attempted reforms were insufficient—there was lacking a competent clergy. What ecclesiastics were then available shared, for the most part, the general corruption of the Roman priests. Jacob, too, had directed his attention to this point at the very outset; he had sent for six scholars from the Roman Collegium Germanicum as assistants in 1568, and these were duly followed by others. Moreover, the Jesuits of Treves, where there had been a Jesuit establishment since 1560, stood in high honor with Jacob; in 1570 he fitted up for them the Minorite cloister in Treves, adding wealthy endowments, so that their school soon flourished to such a degree that from 1573 to 1589 the average attendance is estimated at 1,000 students annually. In 1580 Jacob also founded a college for them at Coblenz. Yet the service rendered by all these useful auxiliaries became really sufficient only when through their help it became feasible to train up a suitable clergy. In vain did Portia, in 1577, bespeak the institution of a priestly seminary, and the project was first realized by Jacob's like-minded successor, John of Schönberg, in 1585. Jacob's reforming activity encountered difficulties in the attitude of the Treves cathedral chapter, which was not inclined to comply with the strict requirements of the Council of Trent; and again, the necessary *placetum regium* from the Brussels government for the Luxembourg domains of the archdiocese occasioned contentions over the prerogatives of the spiritual and the temporal power. On the other hand, the incorporation of the abbey of Prüm as a part of the archbishopric of Treves was a great gain; its opulent resources accrued to the benefit of Jacob's endeavors in the cause of reform. The rejection in 1580 by imperial decision of the claim of the city of Treves to hold charter immediately of the empire likewise strengthened the cause of the Counter-Reformation.

Jacob's Achievement.

Jacob died June 4, 1581. Neither his personality nor his activity can be called great; but the way once having been pointed out, even lesser intellects, led by capable counselors, could carry through the Counter-Reformation. True, the status of the archdiocese was not entirely satisfactory at the time of Jacob's death; but his zealously Catholic-minded successor, John of Schönberg, continued the work along Jacob's lines, and completed the reforms by him begun. Out of the schools of the Jesuits there eventually grew up a generation submissive to the Church; and in many channels of activity the fathers of the Society of Jesus imparted their spirit to the population at large. In connection with the revival of church life, Jacob himself had shown the best of examples; the Roman nuncios continually praise his manner of life, his zeal, his loyalty to the papal see, and hold him up as a pattern for all German prelates. If he did not succeed in accomplishing the reform completely, the decisive turn came to pass under his administration.

Walter Goetz.

Bibliography: C. von Stramberg, *Rheinischer Antiquarius* i. 2, pp. 295 sqq., Coblenz, 1863; J. Marx, *Geschichte des Erzstifts Trier*, vol. i., Trier, 1858; A. Kluckhohn, *Briefe Friedrichs des Frommen*, Brunswick, 1867–70; M. Lossen, *Der kölnische Krieg*, Gotha, 1882; J. Ney, *Die Reformation in Trier, 1559*, Halle, 1906.

JACOB OF JUETERBOG: Roman Catholic reformer; b. near Jüterbog, Brandenburg, 1381; d. at Erfurt 1465. As a youth he entered the Polish Cistercian monastery named Paradise, and was sent by its abbot to the University of Cracow, where he became professor and university preacher. In 1441, finding the Cistercian discipline too lax, he joined the Carthusians, and removed to the monastery Ad Montem Sancti Salvatoris in Erfurt. Here he was active not only as a writer on canon law and theology, but also as professor of law at the university. In 1455 he became its rector. He was intent upon a regeneration of monastic life. His propositions of reform, laid down in *Petitiones religiosorum pro reformatione sui status* and *De* *negligentia praelatorum*, rest upon the view that the pope is only the most prominent member of the Church; the infallible presence of the Holy Spirit is promised not to him, but to the Church, which has the power to depose the pope. He developed these thoughts in a reformatory memorial addressed in 1449 to Pope Nicholas V., under the title *Avisamentum ad papam pro reformatione ecclesiae.* A later work, *De septem statibus ecclesiae*, contains the passionate lamentation of a hopeless man; its aged author did not believe any longer in the possibility of a reform. In spite of his attempts at moral reforms, he did not deviate from orthodox Catholicism. He wrote also a great number of works on canon law, ethics and ascetics, which, however, have mostly perished. The liberal tendency introduced by him culminated in humanism at the time of Luther. PAUL TSCHACKERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. W. Kampschulte, *Die Universität Erfurt*, i. 15–16, Treves, 1858 (from the Roman Catholic point of view; cf. *KL*, vi. 1166–71); C. Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, i. 208–216, Edinburgh, 1874 (from the Protestant viewpoint); Pastor, *Popes*, ii. 45–49, 93, 94, 106.

JACOB OF KIEF. See NESTOR.

JACOB OF MIES (called **Jacobellus,** from his small stature): Bohemian reformer, colaborer of John Huss; b. at Mies (15 m. w. of Pilsen), Bohemia, after 1350; d. at Prague Aug. 9, 1429. He studied at Prague, receiving both the bachelor's and the master's degree in theology, and became pastor of the Church of St. Michael and an outspoken supporter of John Huss. In 1410 he took part in the disputations regarding Wyclif, defending the latter against archiepiscopal condemnation. His study of Scripture and the Fathers had showed him that the withholding of the cup in the administration of the Lord's Supper to the laity was an arbitrary measure of the Roman Church. In 1414 he propounded and defended his views in a public disputation; and when Huss, at that time in jail at Constance, accepted them, he began to administer the cup to his parishioners, in spite of the remonstrances of the bishop and the university. His example was quickly followed by other pastors in Prague. The fathers of the council, who were much alarmed, issued a curious decree, admitting in theory as truth what in practise they condemned as heresy. Though Jacob would by no means submit, he was not removed from his office, perhaps because in other points, as, for instance, in the doctrine of purgatory, he agreed with the Roman Church. During the last decade of his life Jacob was regarded as one of the foremost of the Utraquist theologians. (J. LOSERTH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. H. Gillett, *Life and Times of John Huss*, i., chap. xviii., ii. chap. iii., Philadelphia, 1861; *KL*, ii, 1315; Neander, *Christian Church*, v. 297, 331, 337, 338. 367.

JACOB (JAMES) OF NISIBIS: Bishop of Nisibis, the chief city of Mygdonia, in northeastern Mesopotamia; d. 338. He is known also as Jacob of Mygdonia and Jacob the Great. After leading a severe life in the mountains of Kurdistan with Eugenius, the founder of Persian monasticism, he became first, or second, bishop of Nisibis in 309. In 313 he began to build the great church, the ruins of which still bear his name, and finished it in 320. He attended the Council of Nicæa in 325, and the sudden death of Arius (q.v.) is attributed especially to his prayers (cf. the *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae* [=*Propylaeum ad ASB, Novembris*], ed. H. Delehaye, Brussels, 1902, Jan. 13), as is also the protection of Nisibis against Sapor II. He was also present at the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem. No writings of Jacob's are known, the great work in twenty-two or twenty-three parts ascribed to him being really the production of Aphraates (q.v.), with whom he was early confounded. The Armenians mistakenly call him the friend of Gregory the Illuminator. His day, with the Syrians, is the 12th Iyar (May); with the Armenians, Dec. 15; with the Copts, the 18th Tobi (Jan.); in the Greek Church, Jan. 13 (14) and Oct. 31; in the Roman martyrology, July 15. E. NESTLE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Ephraem, *Carmina Nisibena*, ed. G. Bickell, pp. 11, 20, 97, Leipsic, 1866; Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, iv. 43, Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2d ser., i. 551; Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.*, i. 7, ii. 26, *NPNF*, 2d ser., iii. 44–46, 91–92; Philostorgius, *Hist. eccl.*, iii. 23; Gennadius, *De vir. ill.*, i.; *Acta martyrum et sanctorum*, ed. P. Bedjan, iii. 393, iv. 262, Paris, 1890–97; J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, i. 17, 395, 557, ii. 398, 588. Consult: Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, iii. 369–372, 525–526; A. P. Stanley, *Lectures on the Hist. of the Eastern Church*, lect. v., London, 1884; *DCB*, iii. 325–327.

JACOB (JAMES) OF SARUG: Bishop of Sarug; b. at Kurtam on the Euphrates toward the end of 451; d. Nov. 29, 521. He is mentioned about 503 as visiting presbyter (*periodeutēs*) at the capture of Amida, and became bishop of Batnan (Batnae) in the district of Sarug in 519. He was a most prolific writer, and was called the "doctor" (*malpana*) of the Syrians or of the whole Church, and "the channel of the Holy Ghost." His memory is celebrated by Jacobites and Maronites (July or Dec. 29) and even the Nestorians recognize him, though he was monophysite till his end. Seventy scribes are said to have been always busy copying his homilies, which are all in the dodecasyllabic meter which bears his name. Seven hundred and sixty-three homilies are ascribed to him, besides other works: Bar Hebræus had 182 before him, and there are 233 in the Vatican. Four volumes of his *Homiliae selectae* have been published by P. Bedjan (Paris and Leipsic, 1903–08), but most of his works are still in manuscript. E. NESTLE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On his works cf. W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac MSS. in the British Museum*, pp. 502–505, London, 1877. The works are not published in collected form; some are in: *Acta sanctorum martyrum orientalium*, ed. S. E. Assemani, ii. 230, Florence, 1748; *Acta martyrum et sanctorum*, ed. P. Bedjan, i. 131, 160, iii. 665, iv. 471, v. 615, vi. 650, Paris, 1890–97; *ZDMG*, vols. xii.–xv., xxv., xxviii.–xxxi., 1858 sqq.; W. Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents*, pp. 86–107, London, 1864; his letter to Stephan bar Sudaili, a Syrian mystic, is edited and translated by A. L. Frothingham in *Stephen bar Sudaili*, Leyden, 1886; a discourse on Alexander is translated by E. A. W. Budge, London, 1889; six homilies were rendered into German by P. Zingerle, Bonn, 1867; another is published by Sib'ilani, Beirut, 1901. Consult: J. B. Abbeloos, *De vita et scriptis S. Jacobi . . . Sarugi*, Louvain, 1867; P. Martin, in *Revue des sciences ecclésiastiques*, 4th ser., vol. iii., 1876; J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, i. 283-340, Rome, 1719; *DCB*, iii, 327–328.

JACOB (JAMES) OF VITRY (JACQUES DE VITRY): Bishop of Akko, cardinal bishop of Tusculum; b. at Vitry (20 m. s.e. of Châlons-sur-Marne); d. at Rome Apr. 30, 1240. While a student in Paris he heard of the miraculous deeds of Mary of Nivelles, in Belgium, who, from about 1205, belonged to the society of Beguines organized by the mother of Ægidius, prior of Oignies, on the southern border of the province of Namur. He soon removed to Oignies as canon of the Augustinian chapter. In his intercourse with the Beguines, and especially with Mary, he appropriated views and principles which from this time decided the course of his life. At the wish of Mary, about 1210, he procured ordination as priest. About 1211 he undertook a pilgrimage to Rome. Afterward he became, through Mary, acquainted with Bishop Fulco, of Toulouse, who, in 1213, adopted him as companion in his agitation for a crusade against the Albigenses. Jacob left Oignies after Mary's death (June 23, 1213), and preached in North France in behalf of a crusade against the heretics. Soon he preached also a new crusade to the Holy Land. His success induced the cathedral chapter of Akko to elect him bishop, but Jacob preferred to remain in France, and went to Italy in 1216 to try to secure appointment as legate for the crusade in that country. Honorius III., however, consecrated him bishop of Akko, and Jacob went to his eastern see. Thence he traveled as an itinerant preacher through all places that were still in the possession of the Christians, and eagerly participated in the expeditions of the large army of crusaders that gathered in Akko. In May, 1218, he marched against Damietta, but the plan failed and in 1221 he was compelled to return to Akko. From that time he tried all possible means to rid himself of his office, but the pope was relentless. Nevertheless he allowed Jacob to return to Europe in 1226 to preach the crusade as he had done in 1214. In this function he appears in 1227 in northern France, and also in the bordering districts of Germany. Later he became temporarily vicar of the bishopric of Liége; and finally Gregory IX., his intimate friend and protector, released him from his Oriental office, and made him bishop of Tusculum, Frascati, and cardinal (1228).

Jacob of Vitry was first of all a preacher. His whole literary activity was governed by the habit of gathering material for sermons and religious devotion. Two things contributed to his success and influence as a preacher: (1) his skill in illustrating moral principles by examples, anecdotes, parables, and fables; and (2) his manner of addressing sermons to groups and classes, such as prelates, secular and regular canons, scholars, lawyers, monks, knights, merchants, etc. Both were innovations and created a new epoch in the development of the art of preaching. Encouraged by the popularity of his sermons, Jacob collected them at the end of his life. He makes six divisions in this collection: i.–v., *sermones de tempore*, sermons in the usual style for the pericopes of the church year; vi., *sermones vulgares*, sermons for different classes. The latter are of considerable value for the history of Church and culture, depicting in realistic manner the conditions of West European society of his age. Jacob's homiletic and edificatory tendencies characterize him also as a historian. His most important historical works are the *Liber de mulieribus Leodiensibus* and *Vita S. Mariae Oigniacensis* which were composed between 1213 and 1216. The life of Mary contains the most valuable documents for the inner history of the older Beguinism. Of less importance, though of greater renown, is his *Historia orientalis* or *Historia Hierosolymitana abbreviata*, which he began in 1219. It is largely copied from a similar work of William of Tyre. Of much greater historical value are his letters from 1216 to 1221, which depict the Fifth Crusade with great fidelity. (H. BÖHMER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For a guide to the chief editions of his Letters and his *Historia orientalis* consult Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 633–634. For his life consult: *ASB*, June, iii. 237–258; F. L. Matzner, *De Jacobi Vitriacensis . . . vita et rebus gestis*, Munich, 1863; idem, in *KL*, v. 1176–1187; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, xviii. 209–246; M. Barroux, *Jacques de Vitry*, Paris, 1885; T. A. Archer and C. L. Kingsford, *The Crusades*, passim, New York, 1895; and other literature cited under CRUSADES. On his writings consult: J. L. D. G. Saint-Genvis, *Sur les lettres inédites de Jacques de Vitry*, Brussels, 1847; G. Zacher, *Die Historia orientalis des Jacob von Vitry*, Königsberg, 1885.

JACOB, EDGAR: Church of England bishop of St. Albans; b. at Crawley Rectory, near Winchester, Nov. 16, 1844. He was educated at New College, Oxford (B.A., 1868), and was ordered deacon in 1868 and ordained priest in the following year. He was curate of Taynton, Oxfordshire (1868–69), Witney (1869–71), and St. James', Bermondsey (1871–72), domestic chaplain to the bishop of Calcutta (1872–76), and commissary to the same prelate (1876–88). In 1877 he had charge of Wilberforce Memorial Mission, South London, and was vicar of Portsea (1878–96). In 1896 he was consecrated bishop of Newcastle, and in 1903 was translated to his present see of St. Albans. He was also examining chaplain to the bishop of Winchester in 1876–79, honorary canon of Winchester in 1884–1896, honorary chaplain to the Queen in 1887–90 and chaplain in ordinary in 1890–96, rural dean of Landport and chaplain of the Portsmouth prison in 1892–96, and select preacher at Oxford in the same year. He has written *The Divine Society: or, The Church's Care of Large Populations* (Cambridge lectures on pastoral theology; London, 1900).

JACOBI, yā-kō′bî, **FRIEDRICH HEINRICH:** German philosopher; b. at Düsseldorf Jan. 25, 1743; d. at Munich Mar. 10, 1819. He studied at Frankfort and Geneva, and in 1764 became the head of his father's business in Düsseldorf. After his appointment to the council for the duchies of Jülich and Berg in 1772 he devoted himself entirely to literature and philosophy. His house at Pempelfort, near Düsseldorf, became the meeting-place of distinguished literary men. Among his more intimate friends were Wieland, Hamann, Herder, Lessing, and Goethe. On account of the political agitation of the time he went to Holstein in 1794. During the next ten years he resided chiefly at Wandsbeck, Hamburg, and Eutin. In 1804 he accepted a call to Munich in connection with the proposed Academy of Sciences there. He was president of the academy from its opening in 1807 till 1812. His writings are characterized by poetic fancy and religious sentiment rather than by logical necessity. He held that the understanding can only join and disjoin given facts, without explaining them, and that knowledge deduced in this way is conditioned and relatively unimportant, being always related to a background of existence which forever remains beyond abstract thinking. All demonstrable knowledge, therefore, is relative and conditioned; it does not touch the ultimate nature of things. The faculty by which we grasp ultimate facts is not the understanding, but faith, which Jacobi identified with reason. It was Jacobi who first pointed out the fatal contradiction involved in Kant's application of the category of causality to the *Ding an sich.* His doctrine of the relativity of knowledge was later exploited by Sir William Hamilton. Jacobi's principal works are the two philosophical novels, *Woldemar* (2 vols., Flensburg, 1779) and *Eduard Allwills Briefsamlung* (Breslau, 1781); *Ueber die Lehre des Spinoza* (1785; enlarged ed., 1789); *David Hume über den Glauben, oder Idealismus und Realismus* (1787), containing his criticism of Kant; *Ueber das Unternehmen des Kritizismus, die Vernunft zu Verstande zu bringen* (Hamburg, 1801); and *Von den göttlichen Dingen und ihrer Offenbarung* (Leipsic, 1811), which was directed against Schelling. During his last years Jacobi was employed in collecting and editing his *Werke* (6 vols., Leipsic, 1812–24). His *Auserlesener Briefwechsel* was edited by F. Roth (2 vols., 1825–27). Max Jacobi edited *Briefwechsel zwischen Goethe und F. H. Jacobi* (1846).

Bibliography: J. A. Schmid, *Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi, Eine Darstellung seiner Persönlichkeit und seiner Philosophie als Beitrag zu einer Geschichte des modernen Weltproblems*, Heidelberg, 1908; *F. H. Jacobi nach seinem Leben, Lehren und Wirken*, ed. Schlichtigroll, Weiller and Thiersch, Munich, 1819; J. Kuhn, *Jacobi und die Philosophie seiner Zeit*, Mainz, 1834; F. Deycks, *F. H. Jacobi im Verhältniss zu seinen Zeitgenossen*, Frankfort, 1849; F. D. Maurice, *Modern Philosophy*, pp. 644–651, London, 1862; E. Zirngiebl, *F. H. Jacobi's Leben, Dichten und Denken*, Vienna, 1867; L. Lévy-Bruhl, *La Philosophie de Jacobi*, Paris, 1894; N. Wilde, *F. H. Jacobi: a Study in the Origin of German Realism*, New York, 1894. Consult also J. E. Erdmann, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1895–1896, Eng. transl., 3 vols., London, 1892–98.

JACOBI, JUSTUS LUDWIG: Professor in Halle; b. at Burg (14 m. n.e. of Magdeburg) Aug. 12, 1815; d. at Halle May 31, 1888. He studied in Halle, and in Berlin, where in 1841 he became privat-docent, and in 1847 professor extraordinary; in 1851 he went as ordinary professor of theology to Königsberg, in 1855 to Halle. As representative of the "mediating theology" and advocate of the Evangelical Union, he was involved in various controversies with the confessional party. By founding the home for deaconesses in Halle with the wife of Professor Tholuck, he took a practical part in the charitable works of the Church. His writings betray the influence of Neander. In *Die Lehre des Pelagius, ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte* (Leipsic, 1842) he represented the standpoint of Augustine. The first part of *Kirchliche Lehre von der Tradition und heiligen Schrift* appeared at Berlin, 1847. His *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (part i., Berlin, 1850) is characterized by a thorough presentation of the sources combined with a fine appreciation of external conditions as well as of internal development, measured by the central doctrine of sin and grace. He also wrote *Die Lehre der Irvingiten verglichen mit der heiligen Schrift* (1853; 2d ed., 1868); *Professor Schlottmann, die hallesche Fakultät und die Centrumspartei* (2d ed., Halle, 1882), a defense of his colleague against the aggressive tendency of the Roman curia in the so-called Kulturkampf; and *Streiflichter auf Religion, Politik, und Universitäten der Centrumspartei* (1883). He commemorated his teachers in *Erinnerung an D. August Neander* (1882), and *Baron von Kottwitz* (1882).

Bibliography: J. Jacobi, *J. L. Jacobi und die Vermittelungstheologie seiner Zeit*, Gotha, 1889.

JACOBITES: The Jacobites are an offshoot of the Syrian Monophysites. While the Syrians were the bearers of Christianity in the East, nowhere has ecclesiastical cleavage produced deeper fissures than among them. And the same might be said also of political relations. The peace between the Persians and Jovinian in 363 made a sharp distinction between Syrians of the Roman empire and those of Persia, which has continued to the present. In religion it was differences concerning Christology which produced the deep rifts, especially those connected with the names of Eutyches and Nestorius. Hence one speaks no more of "an Aramaic nation," rather he speaks of two peoples of Aramaic lineage as distinct as two nationalities. Indeed, authorities do not use the term Jacobitic Church or Nestorian Church, they employ the terms Jacobitic people, Nestorian people. The mutual dislike of these two descendants from a common stock is scarcely less intense than their common hatred of Mohammedans. These peoples seem to have lost consciousness of racial bonds; they speak and write two dialects of a common speech, and this difference goes back to an early time, since the division had its origin in the fifth century. By the term Jacobites is meant now the Syrian Monophysites, though in earlier times Egyptian Monophysites were also included. How early the term came into use is not known; it occurs certainly in the anathemas of the Council of Nice (787). The emperors Zeno and Anastasius favored this form of teaching, and it was introduced among the Syrians by Barsumas of Edessa, Xenaias Philoxenus of Mabug, and Severus of Antioch. Under Justinian I. many Syrian bishops were deposed and exiled for refusing recognition to the deliverances of the Council of Chalcedon. Under the protection of the Empress Theodora, bishops were consecrated for the East and South, and particularly Jacobus Baradæus, whose labors in behalf of monophysitism were epoch-making.

General Description.

Jacobus Baradæus (Jacob Baradai) was born at Tella Mauzalat (55 m. e. of Edessa) toward the close of the fifth century, and died at the monastery of Cassianus, on the Egyptian border, July 30, 578. He was educated in the monastery of Phasilta near Nisibis, lived for fifteen years as a monk in Constantinople, and was consecrated bishop in 541 or 543. Clad in rags, he then wandered from Egypt to the Euphrates and to the islands of the

Jacobus Baradæus.

Mediterranean for nearly forty years, expounding his doctrines, ordaining deacons and priests, and consecrating bishops, doing his work in the daytime and traveling at night sometimes forty miles to a new place of labor. He is said to have consecrated two patriarchs and twenty-seven bishops, and to have created 100,000 priests and deacons. After the death of the patriarch Severus, he attached himself to the party of Sergius of Tella, and when Sergius died he had Paulus of Egypt made patriarch. He left little in the shape of literature. An *Anaphora* is ascribed to him (Lat. transl. by E. Renaudot, *Liturgiarum orientalium collectio*, ii., Paris, 1716, pp. 333 sqq.), also a confession extant in Arabic and Ethiopic, the genuineness of which is doubtful. A number of encyclicals in a Syriac manuscript in London are thought to be his.

Their System and Order.

It was from Jacobus Baradæus that the Jacobites took their name, and not from the Apostle, as was stated by John of Ephesus, nor from the Hebrew patriarch. They used to call themselves "the orthodox," and in Egypt went under the names of Theodosians, Severians, and Dioscurians. For the peculiarities of doctrine consult the articles Eutychianism, and Monophysites. In the propagation of this system they were peculiarly zealous. In 1587 Leonard Abel found the agent of the Jacobites ready to acknowledge the Roman Church, but he absolutely refused to condemn Dioscorus and to recognize Chalcedon. In the cultus emphasis is laid upon the making of the bread of the Eucharist of leavened dough mixed with salt and oil, and also upon the addition to the trisagion "who was crucified on your account." They make the sign of the cross with one finger, and the lot is often used at the election of patriarchs and bishops. Their patriarch takes his title from Antioch, though he never resides there, inasmuch as the Greeks regard Jacobites as heretics and refuse to their chief officer residence in Antioch. His seat is therefore not fixed, but is sometimes in a monastery, often in Amid (Diarbekr). During the Jacobitic schism, 1364–1494, there were as many as four officials claiming the title of patriarch in as many different places. The jurisdiction of the Syrian patriarch meets that of the Coptic patriarch, though Jerusalem has both a Coptic and a Syrian-Jacobitic bishop. In the most flourishing period of the Church it had probably 100 bishops. Under the patriarch is the Maphrian, who is the primate of the East, and is sometimes called Catholicus. His office dates as far back as Jacobus Baradæus, though the title is much later. It is not uncommon for a married man to be admitted to the order of deacon or presbyter, though marriage after ordination is not permitted. They have a number of monasteries. The monks are not reckoned among the clergy, yet the bishops are chosen from among the monks, and have charge of the cloisters. The writers of the Jacobites include Jacob of Edessa, Jacob of Sarug, John of Ephesus, John of Dara, Isaac of Antioch, George, bishop of the Arabs, and Philoxenus (qq.v.), also Paul of Tella, Thomas of Heraclea, Stephen bar Sudaili, Dionysius of Tellmahre, Moses bar Kepha, and Dionysius bar Salibi.

History and Present Status.

The emperors of the East, with the exception of Zeno and Anastasius, were opposed to the Jacobitic doctrines, and Justinian I. attempted in vain to unite them with the Catholic Church. The Syrian Jacobites suffered not only under the emperors, but also under the Mohammedans, while their brethren in Egypt seemed to be able better to conciliate the followers of Mohammed. The Crusaders refused them access to the Holy Sepulcher. In the time of Gregory XIII., the Jacobites are said to have numbered 50,000 families, mostly poor, scattered in the towns and villages of Syria, Babylonia, and Mesopotamia. Since that time they seem to have dwindled, as the reports of different travelers are followed from that time to the present. Sachau reports that at Mosul out of 2,328 Christian houses, some 900 were those of Syrian Jacobites. The most recent statistics give 22,700 adherents, twenty-four parishes, forty-two churches, eighty-one priests; in Mosul is the largest number of adherents, 7,000, and in Mardin the next largest number, 4,000. The situation of these people has been the more critical because, while the most of the other sects received recognition from the Porte, they were without it. Through the interposition of the English this disability was removed in 1882. What adds to the difficulty of their position is that they are regarded as heretics by all other sects in the region. Perhaps their most flourishing settlement is at Sadad, on the road from Damascus to Palmyra. In 1653 the Christians of St. Thomas of India (see Nestorians) seem to have had relations with them, though there is no indication of present affiliation. Recently special attempts have been made by the Church of Rome to have the Oriental churches come into connection with it; the encyclical *Præclara* of Leo XIII. of June 20, 1894, and particularly the *Orientalium dignitas ecclesiarum* of Nov. 30, 1894, are evidences of this movement. Several periodicals are employed to further these efforts, notably *Bessarione* in Rome, the *Revue de l'orient chrétien* of Paris, with its auxiliaries, and the *Calendarium ecclesiae utriusque* of Innsbruck. The earlier attempts of the years 1169, 1237, 1247, and 1442 produced no permanent results. (E. Nestle.)

Bibliography: The chief work on the Syrian Jacobites is still J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, especially vol. ii., Rome, 1721. Consult farther: E. Renaudot, *Hist. patriarcharum Alexandrinorum Jacobitarum*, Paris, 1713; M. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, vols. ii.–iii., ib. 1740; J. M. Neale, *Hist. of the Holy Eastern Church*, 2 vols., London, 1850 (for the liturgy); O. H. Parry, *Six Months in a Syrian Monastery*, ib. 1895; C. E. Hammond, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, ed. F. E. Brightman, i. 69–110, ib. 1896; F. Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im 6. Jahrhundert*, Münster, 1899; R. Duval, *La Littérature syriaque*, Paris, 1900; E. Sachau, *Am Euphrat und Tigris*, Leipsic, 1900; J. B. Chabot, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche jacobique d'Antioche (1166–1199)*, 2 vols., Paris, 1900–04; F. C. Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, London, 1904; L. Silbernagl, *Verfassung und gegenwärtiger Bestand sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients*, Regensburg, 1904; Harnack, *Dogma*, passim; *KL*, xi. 1124–34; the periodicals mentioned in the last paragraph above, together with *Echos d'orient*; and the literature under Eutychianism; Monophysites. On

Jacob Baradæus consult H. G. Kleyn, *Jacobus Baradeus*, Leyden, 1882; *DCB*, iii. 328–332.

JACOBS, HENRY EYSTER: Lutheran; b. at Gettysburg, Pa., Nov. 10, 1844. He was graduated at Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, in 1862, and Gettysburg Theological Seminary in 1865. After being a tutor in Pennsylvania College in 1864–67, he was a home missionary at Pittsburg, Pa., in 1867–68, and then pastor and principal of Thiel Hall, Phillipsburg, Pa. (now Thiel College, Greenville, Pa.), in 1868–70. In 1870 he returned to Pennsylvania College as professor of Latin and history (1870–80), classics (1880–81), and Greek (1881–83). Since 1883 he has been professor of systematic theology at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, of which he has also been dean since 1894. Besides editing *The Lutheran Review* from 1882–96, he has translated and edited L. Hutter's *Compend of Lutheran Theology* (in collaboration with G. F. Spieker; Philadelphia, 1867); H. Schmid's *Doctrinal Theology of the Lutheran Church* (in collaboration with C. A. Hay; 1875); *The Book of Concord: or, Symbolical Standards of the Lutheran Church* (2 vols., 1882–83); H. A. W. Meyer's *Commentary on Galatians and Ephesians* (New York, 1884); and F. Düsterdieck's *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Revelation of John* (1887). He likewise edited *The Lutheran Commentary* (13 vols., New York, 1895–99) to which he contributed the portion on Romans and I Corinthians, and *The Lutheran Cyclopaedia* (1899). As independent works he has written *The Lutheran Movement in England during the Reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., and its Literary Monuments* (Philadelphia, 1891); *History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States* (New York, 1893); *Elements of Religion* (Philadelphia, 1894); *Martin Luther, the Hero of the Reformation* (New York, 1898); *German Emigration to America, 1709–1740* (Philadelphia, 1899); and *Summary of the Christian Faith* (1905).

JACOBS, JOSEPH: Jewish folklorist, historian, and critic; b. at Sydney, N. S. W., Aug. 29, 1854. He was educated at Sydney and London universities and at St. John's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1876), and also studied at Berlin. From 1878 to 1884 he was secretary of the Society of Hebrew Literature, and in 1882–1900 was secretary of the Mansion House (later Russo-Jewish) Fund and Committee, taking an active part in behalf of the Russian Jews. He has likewise devoted himself to Jewish history, and for this purpose visited Spain in 1888 to study manuscript sources, later turning his attention to the history of the Jews in England. He helped found the Jewish Historical Society of England, of which he was president in 1898–99, and also assisted in establishing the Maccabeans; and he was long a member of the executive committee of the Anglo-Jewish Association. In 1900 he settled permanently in New York, being revising editor of the *JE* (1901–06), and in 1906 was appointed professor of English literature and rhetoric in the Jewish Theological Seminary, also becoming editor of the *American Hebrew*. As a folklorist he occupies a foremost rank, and was for some years editor of *Folk-Lore* and honorary secretary of the International Folk-Lore Society. Among his publications special mention may be made of the following: *Studies in Jewish Statistics, Social, Vital, and Anthropometric* (London, 1891); *Jews of Angevin England, Documents and Records* (1893); *Studies in Biblical Archæology* (1894); *Sources of the History of the Jews in Spain* (1895); *Jewish Ideals, and other Essays* (1896); and *As Others Saw Him* (an imaginative life of Christ from a Jewish point of view; New York, 1903).

JACOBUS: The Latin form of James (q.v.); see also JACOB.

JACOBUS DE VARAGINE, GIACOMO DA VARAZZE, JACOPO DA VARAZZE (often called Jacob, or James, of Viraggio): Archbishop of Genoa; b. at Casanuova in Varazze (on the coast, 18 m. s.w. of Genoa) c. 1228 (or 1230); d. in Genoa July 16 (?), 1298. He entered the Dominican order in 1244, probably studied at Cologne, Paris, and Bologna, became prior at Genoa (or Asti) about 1258, was provincial prior for Lombardy 1267–76, 1281–86, and archbishop of Genoa 1292–98. He fulfilled several quasi-diplomatic missions and as archbishop exercised feudal authority over San Remo and governed certain churches in the Levant. As archbishop he promoted efforts for the reform of the clergy, intervened successfully to promote peace between Guelph and Ghibelline, and transferred the government of San Remo to the civil authority. He was beatified by Pius VII. in 1816, and is popularly reverenced in Liguria as the promoter of peace.

Jacobus is best known for his writings, especially the "Golden Legend," which was possibly the most popular book of the Middle Ages. This work, known also as "Lives of the Saints" and as *Historia Lombardica*, consists of readings from the lives of the saints for the festivals of the church year. It was probably written before 1260, and was very early translated into at least French, German, English (by William Caxton, 1484?), Italian, and Dutch. Within about fifty years after the invention of printing more than 100 editions of original and translations had been printed. Besides the "Golden Legend" Jacobus wrote several series of sermons "On the Saints," "On the Blessed Virgin," etc., only less popular than the Legend, and also known as "Golden" on account of their popularity. His "Chronicle of Genoa" is a somewhat heterogeneous mass, but not without some historical value. He is alleged also to have made the first translation of the Bible into Italian and there are reasons for supposing that he wrote the "Game of Chess," which, like the "Golden Legend," is best known in English under the name of Caxton. Several other hitherto disputed or lost writings, an "Art of Preaching," a "Summary of Vices and Virtues," *Sermones in visitationibus religiosorum*, etc., have recently been discovered or established as his.

E. C. RICHARDSON.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For editions of the works of Jacobus consult: Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 634–635. An incomplete text of the Chronicle is in Muratori, *Scriptores*, ix. 5–56; the most convenient text of the Sermons is that of Antwerp, 1712, in 6 vols.; the standard edition of the Golden

Legend is by J. G. T. Graesse, Leipsic, 1846, new ed., Wratislaw, 1890; the Eng. transl. of the Golden Legend by Caxton, with introduction and notes by Eales, was published London, 1888, and a sumptuous edition, ed. W. Morris and F. S. Ellis, 3 vols., ib. 1892. The prefaces to the many editions and translations contain biographical and bibliographical material. The standard monographs are: P. Anfossi, *Memorie istoriche appartenenti alla vita del . . . Jacopo da Voragine*, Genoa; G. Spotorno, *Notizie storico-critico del . . . Giacomo da Varazze*, Genoa, 1823; and V. M. Palazza, *Vita del . . . Giacomo da Varazze*, Genoa, 1867. Consult also M. Waresquiel, *Le Bienheuerux Jacques de Voragine*, Paris, 1902; J. C. Broussole, *Préface à la Légend dorsée*, Paris, 1907. The *Princeton Theological Review* for April, 1903, contains an article on the Golden Legend, and for July, 1904, one on "Voragine as a preacher." Consult farther: J. Quétif and J. Echard, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum*, i. 454–459, ii. 818, Paris, 1719–21; *ASB*, Jan., i., pp. xix.–xx.; *KL*, vi. 1178–82.

JACOBUS, MELANCTHON WILLIAMS: The name of two American divines.

1. Presbyterian pastor and educator; b. at Newark, N. J., Sept. 19, 1816; d. at Allegheny, Pa., Oct. 28, 1876. He was graduated from the College of New Jersey (Princeton) in 1834, and from the Princeton Theological Seminary in 1838. The following year he was instructor in Hebrew at the seminary. In Sept., 1839, he entered upon a pastorate of twelve years at the First Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn. In 1851 he became professor of Oriental and Biblical literature in the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pa., and retained this position till his death. He was also pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church, Pittsburg, 1858–1870. In 1870 he presided, conjointly with Philemon H. Fowler, at the opening of the first General Assembly of the reunited Presbyterian Church, old and new schools. His principal works are *Notes on the New Testament* (4 vols., 1848–59); *Notes on the Book of Genesis* (2 vols., 1864–65); and *Notes on the Book of Exodus* (1874).

Bibliography: *Presbyterian Reunion: a Memorial Volume*, pp. 530–532, New York, 1871; R. E. Thompson, in *American Church History Series*, vi. 144, 178, 181, ib. 1895; J. H. Patton, *Popular Hist. of the Presbyterian Church*, p. 407, ib. 1900.

2. Congregationalist, son of the preceding; b. at Allegheny City, Pa., Dec. 15, 1855. He was graduated from Princeton College in 1877, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1881; studied at Göttingen and Berlin (1881–84). He was pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Oxford, Pa. (1884–91), and since 1891 has been professor of New-Testament exegesis and criticism in Hartford Theological Seminary, where he has been dean of the faculty since 1903, and acting president in 1902–03. He was also acting pastor of Center Congregational Church, Hartford, Conn., in 1899–1900, and was Stone lecturer in Princeton Theological Seminary in 1897–98, and lecturer on the New Testament in Mount Holyoke College in 1901 and 1903–04. He has written *A Problem in New Testament Criticism* (Stone lectures; New York, 1900), and has edited *Roman Catholic and Protestant Bibles Compared* (New York, 1905); and *A Standard Bible Dictionary* (1909).

JACOBY, HERMANN KARL JOHANN: German Protestant; b. at Berlin Dec. 30, 1836. He was educated at the University of Berlin and the preachers' seminary at Wittenberg, and after being a teacher in the gymnasium of Landsberg, deacon at Heldrungen castle, and gymnasial teacher and assistant cathedral preacher at Stendal until 1868, was appointed professor of homiletics in the University of Königsberg, a position which he still occupies. He has written *Zwei evangelische Lebensbilder aus der katholischen Kirche* (Bielefeld, 1864); *Liturgik der Reformatoren* (2 vols., Gotha, 1871–76); *Beiträge zur christlichen Erkenntnis* (Gütersloh, 1871); *Christi Tugenden* (Gotha, 1883); *Luthers vorreformatorische Predigt* (Königsberg, 1883); *Allgemeine Pädagogik auf Grund der christlichen Ethik* (Gotha, 1883); *Der erste Brief des Apostels Johannes* (Leipsic, 1891); *Neutestamentliche Ethik* (Königsberg, 1899); and *Die Evangelien des Markus und Johannes, homiletische Betrachtungen* (Leipsic,1903).

Life.

JACOPONE DA TODI, yā″co-pō′nê dā to′dî (properly Jacopo de' Benedetti, Lat. *Jacobus de Benedictis*): Franciscan poet; b. at Todi (24 m. s. of Perugia), c. 1240; d. at the monastery of Collazone (near Perugia) on Christmas night, 1306. Highly endowed by nature, he won both degrees in law at Bologna, and became respected and prosperous in his profession in his native city. He had a beautiful, noble, and virtuous wife, whose death from the fall of a gallery in a theater in 1268 changed his entire life. He renounced all that had formerly appeared to him great and splendid, gave up his business, divided his property among the poor, and joined the Franciscan tertiaries. To express contempt of the world and self he went to absurd extremes of fanaticism and sought to realize literally the "foolishness" described in I Cor. i. 20–29, so that he received the nickname Jacopone ("silly James"), which he accepted as a badge of honor. In 1278 he sought to enter the Franciscan order, but they would not receive him until he proved the soundness of his mind by a *Libellus de mundi contemtu*. Becoming a monk did not change his eccentric habits, and those who judged him most mildly pronounced him *spiritu ebrius*. The conditions of the time drew Jacopone into the storm of political life. His love of truth could not endure the Church's abuses, and many a judgment full of bitter earnestness did he hurl in the days of popes Celestine V. and Boniface VIII. He attacked the latter personally, and, in May, 1297, joined the league of Roman magnates that aimed to bring about the pope's deposition, thereby incurring the ban of the Church. When Boniface VIII. conquered Præneste, in 1298, Jacopone was imprisoned. After the death of Boniface he was liberated, Dec., 1303, and spent his closing years in the monastery of Collazone.

Writings. The Stabat Mater.

Jacopone's literary products include sententious maxims of the sort found in the *Liber conformitatum* compiled by Bartholomew of Pisa, which were gratefully preserved and circulated in the Franciscan order. But a much larger circle of devotees was won by his Italian and Latin lyrics. The Florentine edition by Bonaccorsi (1490) gives 100 Italian poems; the Venetian edition by Tressati (1614) no fewer than 211 satires, odes, penitential hymns, and spiritual love-songs. He sinks himself as a mystic into Christian metaphysics, and celebrates the exalted flight of the soul to God and its nuptials with the divine love; he relates the conflict between the penitent spirit and the body still rebelliously striving under the rod. In other poems he scourges with holy zeal the wrongs of the time—popular customs, luxury of the women, worldliness of the nuns, the papal Antichrist. Finally he brings before the people the life of Jesus, to teach them holy living after the rule of Christ, and celebrates poverty most highly.

The question of authenticity is much more difficult in case of the Latin hymns which bear Jacopone's name, and they have been ascribed to various authors. Apart from *Cur mundus militat* (cf. H. A. Daniel, *Thesaurus hymnologicus*, ii., Leipsic, 1844, 379; S. W. Duffield, *Latin Hymn-Writers*, New York, 1889, 279–280) the most important is the renowned sequence *Stabat mater dolorosa*, beside which the manuscripts contain also the parody *Stabat mater speciosa juxta foenum gaudiosa, dum jacebat parvulus.* The hymn undoubtedly originated in the Franciscan order, but who the actual author was is open to many hypotheses. Gregory the Great, Bernard of Clairvaux, Innocent III., and others have been suggested. The hymn is anonymous in manuscripts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and it is tradition of the Franciscan order which names Jacopone as its author. It was sung by the Flagellants who traversed Italy in 1398 (see FLAGELLATION, FLAGELLANTS) and, according to the *Summa historialis* of Antoninus Florentinus (d. 1450), sang " hymns in Latin and the vernacular, and especially that *Stabat mater dolorosa* which they say Gregory gave forth." The sequence was used in the Church as early as the fourteenth century, and eighty-three German translations alone are known. Of musical settings for this celebrated hymn, the compositions of Palestrina and Pergolese, Astorga, and Haydn are well known. The Protestant judgment of the hymn must be, doctrinally, that it divides reverence between mother and son in a manner never to be endured by a Protestant temperament; but, regarded esthetically, it may be pronounced a pearl among medieval hymns.

E. LEMPP.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bartholomew of Pisa, *Liber conformitatum* p. 60b, Milan, 1510; L. Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, v. 407 sqq., vi. 77 sqq., Rome, 1733; F. A. March, *Latin Hymns*, pp. 171–177, 300–303, New York, 1874 (gives text of *Stabat mater*, notes on it, and notes on Jacopone); H. Thode, *Franz von Assisi und die Anfänge der Renaissance in Italien*, pp. 408 sqq., Berlin, 1885; S. W. Duffield, *Latin Hymn-Writers and their Hymns*, chap. xxv., ib. 1889; *KL*, vi. 1196–98. On the *Stabat mater* the three best works are: F. G. Lisco, *Stabat mater*, Berlin, 1853; C. H. Bitter, *Studie zum Stabat mater*, Leipsic, 1883; J. Kayser, *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Erklärung der ältesten Kirchenhymnen*, ii. 100–192, Paderborn, 1886; A. Tenneroni, in *Nuova Antologia*, June 16, 1907; G. Galli, *Disciplinanti dell' Umbria del 1260 e le loro Landi*, Turin, 1907. Available in English are R. C. Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry*, pp. 262–263, London, 1864; *Seven Great Hymns*, pp. 96–109, New York, 1868 (text, transl., and notes); D. T. Morgan, *Hymns of the Latin Church*, pp. 5–8, 184–186, London, 1871; W. A. Merrill, *Latin Hymns*, pp. 65–66, Boston, 1904 (text and notes); Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 1081–84 (admirable summary of data, details of principal texts and Eng. transls.).

JAEGER, yê′ger, **JOHANN.** See EPISTOLAE OBSCURUM VIRORUM.

JAFFÉ, yāf′fê′, **PHILIPP:** German historian; b. at Schwersenz (6 m. e. of Posen), Prussia, Feb. 17, 1819; d. at Wittenberg Apr. 3, 1870. He studied at the University of Berlin under Ranke, and first distinguished himself by his prize-essay, *Geschichte des deutschen Reichs unter Lothar dem Sachsen* (Berlin, 1843), which was followed by his *Geschichte des deutschen Reichs unter Konrad dem Dritten* (Hanover, 1845). Finding that, as a Jew, the road to academic preferment in Prussia was closed to him, he took up the study of medicine in 1850, and spent the next three years in the universities of Berlin and Vienna. In 1854, however, shortly after he had passed his examination in medicine, he became the collaborator of G. H. Pertz on the *Monumenta Germaniae historica* and edited for that collection a number of works in which he showed great ability in historical-philological criticism. He became extraordinary professor of history at the University of Berlin in 1862, and withdrew from the *Monumenta* the following year. He turned Christian in 1868, broke with his old friends, fell into despondency, and finally committed suicide. Other important works by Jaffé are the invaluable *Regesta pontificum Romanorum . . . ad annum . . . 1198* (Berlin, 1851; 2d ed., Leipsic, 1881–88); the masterly *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum* (6 vols., Berlin, 1864–73); and *Ecclesiæ metropolitanæ Coloniensis codices* (1874), in which W. Wattenbach collaborated with him.

JAGGAR, THOMAS AUGUSTUS: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Southern Ohio; b. in New York City June 2, 1839. He was educated mainly by private tutors, and pursued his theological studies partly privately and partly in the General Theological Seminary, New York City. He was ordered deacon in 1860, and advanced to the priesthood in 1863. After being minister at St. George's, Flushing, N. Y. (1860–62), and Trinity, Bergen Point, N. J. (1863–64), he was rector of Anthon Memorial (now All Souls'), New York City, in 1864–68, St. John's, Yonkers, N. Y., in 1868–70, and Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, in 1870–75. In 1875 he was consecrated first bishop of Southern Ohio. Ill health, from which he had long suffered, however, obliged him to retire from the episcopal office in 1889, although he still retains his seat and vote in the house of bishops. While at Yonkers he founded St. John's Riverside Hospital in that city. He has written *Duty of the Clergy in Relation to Modern Scepticism* (Cincinnati, O., 1883), and *The Personality of Truth* (Bohlen lectures for 1900; New York, 1900).

JAHN, yān, **JOHANN:** Roman Catholic Biblical scholar; b. at Tasswitz, near Znaim (47 m. n.n.w. of Vienna), Moravia, June 18, 1750; d. at Vienna Aug. 16, 1816. He attended the gymnasium at Znaim, studied philosophy at Olmütz, and in 1772 began the study of theology at the Premonstratensian convent of Bruck, near Znaim. After he had taken the vow in 1774 he was employed for a time in pastoral work at Mislitz, but was soon recalled to Bruck as teacher of Oriental languages and Biblical hermeneutics. On the suppression of the convent in 1784, he was given a similar chair in the lyceum at Olmütz, and in 1789 he was transferred to the University of Vienna as professor of Oriental languages, Old-Testament introduction, and Biblical archeology. To this professorship dogmatics was added in 1803. On account of his advanced views concerning the Bible he was honorably removed from his chair in 1805 and promoted to a canonry in St. Stephen's, Vienna. Henceforth he lived in retirement, devoting himself to Biblical and linguistic studies. His most important works are *Einleitung in die göttlichen Schriften des Alten Bundes* (2 parts, Vienna, 1792; 2d ed., 4 vols., 1802–03); *Biblische Archäologie* (5 vols., 1797–1805); *Introductio in libros sacros Veteris Fœderis in compendium redacta* (1804; 2d ed., 1814; Eng. transl., *Introduction to the O. T.*, New York, 1827); *Archæologia Biblica in compendium redacta* (1804; 2d ed., 1814; Eng. transl., *Biblical Archæology*, Andover, 1823); *Enchiridion hermeneuticæ* (1812); *Appendix hermeneutica* (2 fasc., 1813–15); and the posthumous *Nachträge* (Tübingen, 1821). Jahn also published a number of grammars, lexicons, and text-books of Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, and Arabic, and an edition of the Hebrew Bible (4 vols., Vienna, 1806). His *Introductio, Archæologia, Enchiridion,* and *Appendix hermeneutica* were placed upon the Index in 1822.

Bibliography: *Vindiciae Joannis Jahn,* Leipsic, 1822; F. H. Reusch, *Index verbotenen Bücher,* ii. 1083–84, Bonn, 1885; *KL,* vi. 1208–10.

JAINISM.

The Founder (§ 1).
Relation to Buddhism (§ 2).
The Jain Philosophy (§ 3).
Basis in Brahmanism (§ 4).
The System and its History (§ 5).
The Literature (§ 6).

1. The Founder.

The remote origin of Jainism is traced to a teacher named Parsva who lived in north central India in the eighth century before Christ and left a school of thought which did not become active till two centuries later. The immediate founder was a certain Vardhamana, a younger son of Siddartha, and a contemporary of Buddha. The Jain literature, following the usual tendency of religious books to exalt and glorify the founder, represents the father of Vardhamana as king of a large town named Kundagrama or Kundapura, identified as the modern Basukund. Investigation has shown that this place was a mere suburb of the town Vaisali, the modern Besarh. Siddartha could therefore have been at best only headman of a village, though he was connected with the king of Vaisali and with the dynasty then ruling Magadha. Vardhamana consequently belonged to the Kshatriya or warrior class, as did Buddha, therefore to the aristocracy. The traditions represent him as living with his parents till they died, when his elder brother, Nandivardhana, succeeded as head of the household. Vardhamana was then twenty-eight years of age, and he sought and gained permission to enter the spiritual career. For twelve years he followed the life of the meditative ascetic, after which he was recognized as a prophet, having claimed "perfect knowledge and faith," and was hailed Mahavira, "great hero," Jina, "victor," and greeted with other titles indicative of his success. He lived thirty years after this, following the career of a teacher and ascetic, preaching his doctrine and organizing his Church. He died at Papa or Pava, the modern Padraona. His contemporaneity with Buddha is established by the fact that the traditions of Jains and Buddhists alike refer to the same contemporaries, which brings out the farther coincidence that the two religions arose in approximately the same region, north of the center of India, and that Jainism became active and made its early conquests in a region comprising the modern Oudh and the districts of Tirhut and Bihar in western Bengal, where its progress can be traced by inscriptions from the time of Asoka in the third century B.C.

2. Relation to Buddhism.

The rise of two religious leaders of the same caste in the same region and period, bearing the same titles, which were gained in practically the same manner, using a common stock of ideas expressed in a common technic of names and epithets, and founding churches with similar forms of organization, and having each a Nirvana as the goal of human striving, is a phenomenon which might well cause not only dispute between the later adherents of the religions, but also confusion and perplexity among scientific students. For long the resemblances between Buddhism and Jainism were explained by the supposition that one was a schism or an offshoot of the other, and the question of priority was hotly debated. Recent study has cleared the atmosphere not only in the matter of origins, but in exact knowledge of the details of the lives of the founders and of the religious and philosophical conceptions and modifications of such ideas as were inherited from the society and religion existent prior to the rise of these two sects. Thus of the founders it is now known that the birthplaces were different, that Buddha's mother died while he was an infant, while Vardhamana's lived to see him reach maturity; that Buddha entered the ascetic life against the will of his father, Vardhamana after his parent's death and with the consent of his family; and that Buddha lived this life for six years and contemned its results, while Vardhamana pursued it for twelve years and regarded the exercise as salutary, continuing the vocation after reaching sainthood. Among the common titles of the founders are Jina, Arhat, Mahavira, Tathagatha, Buddha, and Paranivrita, every one of which is in the sacred writings of the sects given to the founders. But each sect has a marked and unmistakable preference for a certain set of these different from that preferred by the other. Common to both sects as developed is the worship of the founders; but in Jainism this is consistent with the fundamental ideas of the system, while in Buddhism the primitive ideal rigidly excludes it—the practise there has been fostered by the people's inability to live up to the abstract ideal the Buddhist faith presents. A fundamental doctrine in both sects is that of Ahimsa or the sacredness of all life. In this the principal difference between the two religions is the irrational extreme to which the Jains have carried the practise. The Jain may eat even of vegetables and fruit only such as have no trace of life left—may not pluck the vegetable or fruit from its source—and must strain through a cloth the water he drinks. Further regulations prescribe the covering of the ascetic's mouth and nose with a cloth that no insects may be drawn in with the breath to their death, and the pushing of a broom before him as he walks that no living thing may be crushed by his feet. The systems have developed along similar lines, with orders of monks upon whom severe duties press, and lay communicants from whom a lesser degree of abstinence is demanded. Both have had temples of ambitious structure, in which were placed statues of the founders and their disciples, though those of the Jains are the more monumental. These resemblances and differences are now quite fully accounted for.

3. The Jain Philosophy.

The fundamental assumption of the Jains is the eternity of matter, which is regarded as atomic in structure. Time proceeds in pairs of cycles each of enormous length, in the first of which goodness constantly increases, and in the second diminishes. Since matter is eternal, no necessity arises for creative agency, and Jains have consequently been called atheists. But worship is paid to the Jina, and indeed to Hindu deities, since the native predilection to polytheism has in Jainism, as in Buddhism, been too strong for the philosophy to overcome. Over against the eternity of matter the Jain puts the eternity of individual spirits. The Jain philosophy is therefore dualistic as against the spiritualistic monism of Buddhism. These spirits are bound by the action of Karma (the accumulated effects of all deeds in former existences), but owing to the differences in the manner of conceiving individual existence, that action is regarded differently from the Buddhistic method. To the Buddhist the soul is not a permanent individual entity passing as a unit from one state of existence or incarnation to another, but a dissoluble aggregate of qualities in which not individuality but the effect of Karma is the integrating factor. To the Jain the human spirit is an eternal entity which in its various incarnated lives Karma affects as a permanent individuality. Consequently Nirvana takes a different form in the two religions. Logically in Buddhism it is the annihilation of Karma as an integrating principle, in consequence of which the individual as such ceases to exist. In Jainism Nirvana is release of the soul from union with the body and from connection with matter, but the soul continues consciously to exist. Salvation is wrought through ascetic practises, guided by the three jewels of right faith, right knowledge, and right conduct. For the layman eight reincarnations are necessary to secure release, while the ascetic secures the same result by twelve years of strenuous self-denial, after which he may if he will at once enter Nirvana by *felo de se*. The monks are compelled to take the five major vows, practically identical with those of Buddhism.

4. Basis in Brahmanism.

The great similarity of the two systems and also their mutual dislike led to patient search for the reasons of the resemblances and the differences. Especially have the religious life and obligations of the pre-Jain Brahman ascetic been under review. The result is the discovery that of the Brahman ascetic of early times were demanded four of the five major vows, viz., Ahimsa, truthfulness, honesty, and continence. But besides these points, common to the three systems, there are others which are established as clearly pre-Jainistic. Thus it was required of the Brahman recluse not to change his residence during the rainy season, at other times the period of his stay in a place was limited, though in the later systems the bounds of his stay varied; the rules for dress in all three systems reduce to practically the same basis, and Brahman and Jain ritual provide for the elimination of hair and beard. Even the straining of drinking-water is Brahmanic, and the equipment of cloth and begging-bowl is common to Brahman and Jain. Jainism stands revealed, therefore, as one of the two revolts against Brahmanic teaching, ritual, and doctrine which took form in the sixth century B.C., and for ten centuries threatened the extinction of the parent faith. Yet, like Buddhism, it borrowed thought and even much of its religious terminology and practise from Brahmanism. Its monks are called Yatis, a Brahmanic name for eremite, and the titles given the Jina are commonplaces in pre-Jain Brahmanism.

5. The System and its History.

On such a basis, in the sixth century B.C., in the north central part of India, Vardhamana, after twelve years of asceticism, launched his system. His social status as a Kshatriya opened to him the ears of the wealthy, while his performance of the ascetic vows and the sanctity thus gained won him the reverence of the lower orders of the population. He laid the usual emphasis of the Brahman upon the evil in matter and on the value of the ascetic life as the means to evade it. The older vows were made more stringent; a theology with its heaven and hell and Nirvana was formulated. The system broke with Brahmanism in making its benefits extend to all castes and even to the outcasts, though it was affirmed that all preceding Jinas (twenty-three in number) were of the warrior caste. Its ascetics were called Nirgrantha, "freed from bonds," Yatis, "ascetics," or Sadhus, "holy ones." And since not all could follow the ascetic pattern, provision was made for the lay community. The members vowed obedience to the Jina, the law and the teacher; in the early morning they worshiped at home, and in the temple the image of the Jina, read and recited from the scriptures, sang hymns, and then at different times of the day practised their devotions. Meanwhile they had the privilege of contributing to the support of the monastics, and received the name of upasakas or "worshipers" and sravakas or "hearers." After eight reincarnations they were promised Nirvana. For the monk a more rigorous routine is prescribed, and a speedier release foretold. During the rainy season he seeks shelter in a monastery of the order, for then life is more abundant and movement pregnant with danger to it. For the remaining eight months he takes the road and wanders barefoot and bareheaded; he may not sleep in a bed nor take any conveyance, and may have as his only possessions his cloth, bowl, broom, and sacred books—indeed, these are not reckoned his own. He may not touch metal, may eat no fruit and drink no wine, light no fire, and take no bath except in water which has been previously used by another and has so been rendered void of life. He may not disturb the insects or vermin which torment his flesh, nor do anything that may harm even potential life. After twelve years thus spent he gains his goal and may seize the possession, or may continue in this life as a teacher. Moreover, his discipline covers the inner life as he gains mastery over his own mind, conscience, and heart. Thus the system was laid. In the fourth century B.C. differences of opinion respecting the stringency of the Jina's commands regarding clothing split the religion into two parts, the Svetambaras or "white-clothed" and the Digambaras or "air-clothed." The latter wore a minimum of clothing, sometimes none, and are possibly, even probably, the *Gymnosophoi* of Greek literature. The Svetambaras have both monks and nuns, the Digambaras do not admit women to the ascetic life. The former have divided into seven minor sects, differing only on lesser points of faith or practise. The religion spread to the west and south, the Svetambaras remaining in the northern portion, the Digambaras developing to the south. Its course can be traced by inscriptions dated from the third pre-Christian century until, in the fifth Christian century, it is found far south of Central India. There it met the opposition of the Brahman sages Manikka Vasagar and Tiru Nana Sambandha, who were effective in staying its progress in the tenth century. It has never been a missionary religion in the sense that Buddhism has been, consequently its adherents have been confined to the peninsula. Its numbers, according to the census of 1901, are 1,334,148, though the authorities declare that more exact details would make the total greater, since many known Jains returned themselves simply as "Hindus." The institutions are the temples, the monasteries where the monks spend the rainy season, and the hospitals for animals, where the maimed and even the healthy are supported. A great deal of wealth is in the possession of adherents of the religion, and this is held at the service of the order.

6. The Literature.

The literature of Jainism is as yet comparatively unknown, and until 1870 almost none of it beyond the Kalpa Sutra was in the possession of Occidentals. The general name corresponding to the word Scripture is Siddantha, under which term are included six classes of writings, viz.: twelve Angas, twelve Upangas, ten Painnas, six Ghedasutras, two sutras without special names, and four Mulasutras. There is constant reference in this literature to a class of writings called Purvas, or primitive scriptures, which took form perhaps as early as the fourth century B.C., but are either lost or embodied in the Angas. There are references also to the loss and recovery of these primitive scriptures such as lead to the suspicion that the sacred books of the Jains have passed through experiences like those of the Hebrews, Christians, Zoroastrians, and Confucians. At any rate, so far as known, the present literature does not contain anything recognized as Purva. The Angas are the authoritative scriptures of the Svetambaras, and the authoritative recension took place in the fourth century of our era. The language is the Prakrit, as is that of most of the other literature so far as it is known; some of it is in Gujarati. To each of the Angas there are subsidiary parts, just as there are Brahmanas to the Vedas. The Kalpa Sutra may be called the manual of the Svetambaras. The Jains who went southward developed a later literature different from the Angas, and indeed did much in the way of founding the literature of the Kanarese, Tamil and Telugu; consequently the Digambaras have their own sacred books apart from that of the rival sect. The whole of the Angas reproduce in their literary features the traits of other sacred books, the parts being of unequal merit, often evidently fragmentary, and covering a long period in their dates of origin. They have been subject to recension, in which harmonistic effort is clearly traceable. This often includes slokas or sections of much earlier literature, much as the Pentateuch contains bits of early folk-song like the song of Lamech or of the well. Moreover, commentaries exist which contain alleged quotations which are not in the extant texts, showing that parts have been lost. The codification took place, as is noted above, some 800 years after the origin of the religion. Two series of publications embodying the texts are in course of issue, one begun under the auspices of a wealthy Jain, the late Rao Bahadur Dhanapatisinha, in which some thirty treatises have been produced, with comment and explanation, at Calcutta and Bombay. The Jain Religious Book Society of Murshidabad is publishing the other, which has already duplicated the first series and has added a number not otherwise printed.

Geo. W. Gilmore.

Bibliography: On the literature the most exhaustive study is by A. Weber, in *Indische Studien*, xvi.–xvii., Leipsic, 1883–84, reproduced in English in the *Indian Antiquary*, xvii.–xxi., 1888–92, and in his *Sacred Literature of the Jains*, Bombay, 1893. Consult also A. Guerinot, *Essai de bibliographie Jaina*, Paris, 1906. A very defective translation of the Kalpa Sutra appeared in London, 1848. H. Jacobi has made several of the Sutras available in English in *SBE*, xxi., xlv., with valuable introduction concerning the religion, and has edited the Kalpa Sutra, with introduction and notes, Leipsic, 1879, and the Tattvarthadhigama Sutra, ib. 1906. Other sutras have been edited by Leumann in *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. viii., and in *ZDMG*, vol. xlvi.; also by Hoernle, in *Bibliotheca Indica*, 2 vols., text, commentary and transl., Calcutta, 1888–90.

On the religion the best single discussion is by J. G. Bühler, *Ueber die indische Secte der Jaina*, Vienna, 1887, Eng. transl., *On the Indian Sect of the Jainas*, London, 1903. Consult: H. T. Coleridge, *Essays*, late ed., London, 1879 (good for description, not for explanation of origins); J. Bird, *Historical Researches on the Origin and Principles of the . . . Jaina Religion*, Bombay, 1847; E. Thomas, *Jainism*, London, 1877; J. Burgess, *Jain Cave Temples*, in Fergusson's *Cave Temples*, ib. 1880; idem, *Temples and Jaina Caves in Western India*, 2 vols., 55 plates, ib. 1881–1883; J. S. Warren, *Les Idées philosophiques et religieuses des Jainas*, in *Annales de Musée Guimet*, x. 321–411, Paris, 1887; E. W. Hopkins, *Religions of India*, pp. 280–297, Boston, 1895 (not up to the standard of the rest of his book, his verdict is disparaging and condemnatory); Jogendra Nath Bhattacharjee, *Hindu Castes and Sects*, Calcutta, 1896; V. A. Smith, *The Jain Stupa and Other Antiquities of Mathura*, India Archæological Survey, Re-

ports, vol. xx., 1901; A. Barth, *Bulletin des religions de l'Inde*, iv., Paris, 1902; *RHR*, xlv. 171–185 (by Barth), xlvii. 34–50 (by A. Guerenot). The files of the *ZDMG* contain much important matter by the few students of the subject, e.g., vol. i (by A. Weber), xxxii. 509 sqq., xxxiv. 247 sqq., xxxv. 667 sqq., xxxviii. 1 sqq., xl. 92 sqq. (all by Jacobi), xxxiv. 445 sqq. (by Klatt), xxxiv. 748 sqq. (by Oldenberg), xlviii (by Leumann, on the Jain legends). Similarly contributions have been made to the *Indian Antiquary* by various observers, including Hoernle and Bühler. The files of the *JRAS* contain occasional articles of value.

JAIR (Hebr. *Ya'ir* and *Ya'ir*): An Old-Testament name which takes two forms and originally had as an element a divine name which has sloughed off. *Ya'ir* (II Sam. xxi. 19) was a Bethlehemite, and father of the Elhanan who slew Goliath of Gath, or his brother (I Chron. xx. 5). *Ya'ir* (Esther ii. 6) is the father of Mordecai, and also the name of a strong clan in the district east of the Jordan. With the last this article is concerned.

Judges x. 3–5 speaks of a Jair who was one of the minor judges and ruled Israel twenty-two years, a period which falls within the interregna of the greater judges, and is included in the chronology which reckons 480 years between the Exodus and Solomon (I Kings vi. 1). Nöldeke identifies this Jair with the eponymous ancestor of the Jair clan. Though Jair the judge can find no place in the history of Israel, the Judges passage is serviceable in investigating the clan. The thirty cities there mentioned (the Hebrew for "cities" involves a word-play between the words for city and colt which the Greek *poleis* and *pōlous* reproduces) suggest thirty divisions of the clan, and in one of these cities, Camon, Jair is said to have been buried. Camon suggests the *Kamun* which Antiochus III. took on the march from Pella to Gephrun (Polybius, V., lxx. 12), which is located on an old road by the identification of Pella with the modern Tabakat Fahil and of Gephrun with Kaẓr Wadi el-Ghafr, not far from Irbid. A Kamm and Kumem were located by Dr. Schumacher from six to ten miles east of Irbid. Kamm is a ruined city of considerable extent, Kumem a modern village a mile south of the road with remains of an old wall still showing; the former may be the Camon of Judges, and may indicate the region of the cities of Jair south of the Yarmuk and in the northern part of Gilead.

Other Old-Testament passages speak of the tents (or tent-villages) of Jair. Num. xxxii. 41 tells of the conquest of these tents, but does not state the place of departure or the time: the intention of the compiler was to place it in the time of Moses; but that was not the original meaning, and the event must have taken place from a starting-point in the West Jordan land and when Israel was growing strong in the early days of the kingdom. The conclusion of commentators that the thirty cities grew from earlier "tent-villages" disregards the fact that this was not a region frequented by nomadic herders. Consequently the "tent-villages" of Jair indicate nomadic settlements, the "cities" rather the habitations of the settled portions of the clan, the former, on the basis of I Kings iv. 13, to be placed on the border of the desert. Yet this passage is a later addition and is not in the Septuagint. Deut. iii. 14 makes Jair conqueror of the whole region of Argob: Josh. xiii. 30 gives to Jair sixty cities. According to I Chron. ii. 23, the shepherds of the clan were in early times subdued. Num. xxxii. 41 makes Jair belong to the tribe of Manasseh. According to I Chron. ii. 21–23 the Judahite Hezron married a daughter of Machir, whose grandfather, Jair, possessed twenty-three towns in Gilead, representing a mingling of the two tribes in which Judah took the leadership. But this expresses a relationship of post-exilic times, and the number of cities has diminished. This account forms the bridge to the story in I Macc. v. 24–54 of the removal of the Gileadite Jews for security of life to Jerusalem: it was in part the Jews of the cities of Jair on whose account Judas was concerned. The passage in the Chronicler seems to have been taken in part from an old source.

(H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Kuenen, *De Stam Manasse*, in *ThT*., xi (1877), 478 sqq.; G. Schumacher, *Northern Ajlun*, pp. 137–138, London, 1890; idem, *Das südliche Basan*, in *ZDPV*, xx (1897), 109, 173; *DB*, ii. 540; *EB*, ii. 2315; *JE*, vii. 65–66.

JAMAICA. See WEST INDIES.

JAMBLICHUS. See NEO-PLATONISM.

JAMES. See also JACOB.

JAMES.

I. The Apostles and the Brother of Jesus.
1. James the Son of Zebedee.
2. James the Son of Alphæus.
3. James the Just.
Brother, Step-brother, or Cousin of Jesus (§ 1).
New-Testament Idea. Brother (§ 2).
His Life and Work (§ 3).
II. The Epistle of James.
The Readers (§ 1).
Aim, Contents, and Style (§ 2).
Date, Canonicity, and Reception (§ 3).

I. The Apostles and the Brother of Jesus: In the New Testament two, or better three, notable men bear the name of James.

1. James the Son of Zebedee: In the Synoptic Gospels this James appears only in close connection with his brother John. Their father pursued the calling of a fisherman on the Lake of Galilee (Mark i. 19; Matt. iv. 21–22), perhaps near Capernaum (cf. Luke v. 10 with iv. 31, 38), with his sons and with the help of hired servants (Mark i. 20). His wife, Salome, was one of those companions of Jesus who cared for the needs of his daily life (Mark xv. 41; Luke viii. 3). It is uncertain whether Salome was in any way related to Jesus, for it is doubtful if the sister of Jesus' mother (John xix. 25) can be identified with Salome (Mark xv. 40). Certain only is her pious devotion to Jesus, whom she faithfully followed in his wanderings through Galilee, on his last journey to Jerusalem, and also on his way to crucifixion (Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40). Her firm faith in the Messianic destiny of Jesus and her impetuous nature are shown in her somewhat rash prayer to the Lord that, in his kingdom, he should seat her sons on his right hand and on his left (Matt. xx. 20 sqq.). These characteristics she transmitted to her sons; of these, James seems to have been the elder, since in the lists of the Apostles and usually elsewhere he is named before John (Matt. x. 2; Mark ii. 17; cf. Luke vi. 14). It can not be determined from John i. 40 whether James had already come into contact with Jesus in the following of the Baptist at the Jordan;

the summary way, however, in which both brothers were called by Jesus to become his disciples, and the readiness with which they obeyed (Mark i. 19–20), make it appear probable that they were prepared for this summons. From that time they remained disciples of Jesus with all the burning zeal which characterized them. This zeal was not without its drawbacks; it could lead them into heartless fanaticism (Luke ix. 54) and also inspire unbridled ambition (Mark x. 35 sqq.); but it enabled them to endure resolutely the hardest sufferings with Jesus (Mark x. 35 sqq.). How highly Jesus appreciated their fervent nature is apparent in his applying to them the epithet "sons of thunder" (Mark iii. 17) and in his receiving them, with the equally impetuous Peter, into the inner circle of the twelve apostles (Mark v. 37, ix. 2, xiii. 3 sqq., xiv. 33 sqq.). After the departure of the Lord, however, James seems to have become less prominent. Nevertheless, he soon took precedence over the other apostles as the first who gave his life for the faith, since he was executed by order of Herod Agrippa I (Acts xii. 1, 2).

2. James, the Son of Alphæus: This James is mentioned with this name in the four lists of the apostles (Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13), but no other passage of the New Testament can be brought into connection with him or his family. Especially groundless is everything that has been asserted regarding a relationship of James Alphæus (see ALPHÆUS) and his house to Jesus, based on the identity of the names Alphæus and Cleophas. The statement of Hegesippus (in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, III., xi.) that Cleophas was a brother of Joseph, the foster-father of Jesus, can not be accepted, and the identification of the names Alphæus and Cleophas can not be established. Possibly James Alphæus is alluded to in Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xvi. 1, xv. 40; Luke xxiv. 10; if so, it may be inferred from these passages that James's mother was called Mary and belonged to the followers of Jesus, and that he had a brother called Joses, and that the epithet of "the little" was applied to him. Possibly this passage refers to another James of whom nothing further is known. It is altogether improbable, however, that in Luke vi. 16 and Acts i. 13 the designation "Judas of James" [R. V. "Judas the son of James" marg. or, "brother," as in A. V.] signifies that Judas was the brother of James Alphæus, since this designation can only mean "Judas the son of James," and a combination of these passages with those in which a Mary is named as the mother of James and Joses is quite impossible. But neither the apostle Judas Lebbæus (see JUDAS) nor Simon Zelotes is to be regarded as a brother of James Alphæus. Nothing further is heard of James Alphæus, except the legend that he was active in the southwest of Palestine and in Egypt, and was crucified in Ostrakine, in Lower Egypt (Nicephorus, ii. 40).

3. James the Just: A James who was the Lord's brother, head of the community of Jerusalem, is mentioned as a different person from both the apostles in Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3; Acts xii. 17, xxi. 18; I Cor. xv. 7; Gal. i. 19, ii. 9–12, as well as James i. 1; Jude 1. Also, outside of the New Testament, by Josephus (*Ant.* XX., ix. 1), Hegesippus (in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, II. 23), and other Church Fathers.

1. Brother, Step-Brother or Cousin of Jesus.

The view of the early Church was that Jesus and this James were brothers, and James was distinguished from the two apostles of the same name. Clement of Alexandria expressly states that this view, which he himself rejected, was general in his time (*Strom.* vii. 93 sqq.). Tertullian refers to the marriage of Mary after the birth of Jesus and to the mention of his brothers in connection with her, as a proof of the reality of the humanity of Jesus (*De monogamia*, viii.; *De carne Christi*, vii.; "Against Marcion," 19). In the Apostolic Constitutions (ii. 55, vi. 12, 13), besides the twelve apostles and Paul, James, the Lord's brother, is mentioned as one of the advocates of catholic doctrine, and he is reckoned among the seventy disciples. Eusebius counts fourteen apostles; the twelve, Paul and James (on Isa. xvii. 5; *Hist. eccl.*, I., xii., II., i., VII., xix.), and when he once writes of James as the "so-called" brother of the Lord, the context shows that he is not suggesting a more distant relationship. When, however, the idea of the perpetual virginity of Mary gained ground in the Church, the brotherly relationship between Jesus and James was transformed into the more distant one of stepbrother, this view appearing in several popular writings such as the Proto-Gospel of James (ix. 2), the Gospel of Peter, the Gospel of pseudo-Matthew (viii. 4), the Gospel of Thomas (xvi.). and the History of Joseph (ii.). In the period after Epiphanius, the recognition of James as a son of Joseph and Mary is seldom met. On the other hand, the view of Origen, that James was a stepbrother of Jesus, was followed in the East by Ephraem, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Epiphanius, and later by Euthymius; in the West by Hilary, Ambrose, and Ambrosiaster. Alongside of this, however, arose the other opinion that the brothers of Jesus were cousins and were identical with the men of the same name among the apostles. It is possible that Clement of Alexandria entertained this view as well as the hypothesis that James was a stepbrother of Jesus (in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, II., 1). The first assured defender is Jerome, who, in his writings against Helvidius, expounds it, but practically abandons it in his Commentary on Isaiah (xvii. 6), in that he counts fourteen apostles: the twelve, Paul, and the Lord's brother, James. Ambrose and Augustine express themselves even more doubtfully. Gradually, however, the hypothesis of identification was more and more widely accepted in the West. In the Middle Ages it was the predominant theory. On the other hand, it found so little favor in the East that two different festival days, one for James the Just and the other for James Alphæus, remained traditional.

The statements of the New Testament favor the view that James was a full brother of Jesus and the son of Mary. Matt. i. 25 and Luke ii. 7 imply that, after the birth of Jesus, a conjugal relation existed between Joseph and Mary and that they had children. Whenever in the Gospels brothers of Jesus are mentioned, they appear in such a connection with Joseph and Mary, or with Mary alone, that they are clearly regarded as their children (John ii. 12; Matt. xii. 47; Mark vi. 3; Acts i. 14). The designation of Mary as the mother of Jesus, employed in these passages, implies that the word brothers is used in the same proper sense. They could not therefore have been stepbrothers of Jesus, sons of a former wife of Joseph or of a former husband of Mary, or foster-children of Mary (thus J. P. Lange); and just as little only cousins of Jesus and identical with the apostles James Alphæus, Judas Lebbæus, and Simon Zelotes. Moreover, nowhere in the New Testament is James the brother of the Lord called James Alphæus, and nowhere is the word brother used in a sense of distant relationship. That James Alphæus is a brother of the apostles Judas Lebbæus and Simon Zelotes is absolutely excluded by the way in which they are named together, to be distinguished from other brothers who are alluded to in the same way. Besides this the brothers of the Lord are not only named alongside of the apostles as distinct from them (ut sup.), but they appear also as a circle, separate in every way from the disciples of Jesus (Matt. xii. 46; John vii. 5). Only after the departure of the Lord does there arise a closer companionship of the brethren of the Lord with the apostles, and James gains apostolic rank as head of the mother-church in Jerusalem, while still remaining distinct from the apostles (Gal. i. 19, ii. 9; I Cor. xv. 7).

2. New-Testament Idea, Brother.

The story of the material and spiritual life of James, the brother of the Lord, is quite clearly defined in its outlines. During the public ministry of Jesus, his brothers adopted a skeptical attitude, probably because they could not reconcile his lofty claims with the commonplace conditions in which they had lived together in their home. Jesus complains of a lack of recognition on the part of his own relatives (Mark vi. 4), and he could not count them as his spiritual kindred (Mark iii. 31–34). After the miracle of the loaves and fishes in the desert it seems that then the idea of his Messianic task may have dawned upon them, but the humility of his attitude prevented them from confidently believing in him. Even at the time of his Passion, the brothers seem to have separated themselves from his mother, who now believed in him (John xix. 27). Nevertheless, the superhuman patience with which Jesus went to his death may have won their hearts, especially that of James; for to him was vouchsafed an appearance of the risen Christ (I Cor. xv. 7), which affirmed his faith. He therefore appears after the ascension of the Lord as a member of the Christian community, wherein he won a leading position after the death of James, the son of Zebedee, and the flight of Peter. In general, his activity was confined to Jerusalem (Gal. i. 17). He took part in the council of the apostles with Peter and John as one of the three pillars of the Jewish-Christian Church (Gal. ii. 1 sqq.; Acts xv. 1 sqq.). There he showed himself free from the pharisaical and strictly legal views of the Judaizing opponents of Paul who desired to impose upon Gentile Christians the full observance of the Mosaic laws. At the same time he gave the hand of fellowship to Paul in proof of their thorough agreement on the basis of the Gospel. Nevertheless he considered it important that Jewish Christians should strictly observe the laws of their fathers and should require for these laws a certain respect on the part of the Gentile Christians. The standpoint of James also appears in the influence exerted by his friends in Antioch (Gal. ii. 11 sqq.) upon Peter. The Ebionite party in the post-apostolic age endeavored to cover itself with the authority of James and to envelop him with a legendary atmosphere of glory. According to Epiphanius (*Haer.* XXX., xvi.), there were legends even of his ascension to heaven. Concerning the death of James there are two contradictory accounts. Hegesippus relates (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, II. 23) that he was thrown from the tower by the Pharisees, not long before the beginning of the Roman-Jewish war (cf. Zahn, *Forschungen,* vi. 235, Leipsic, 1900), therefore, about 66 A.D. According to Josephus (*Ant.* XX., ix. 1), however, the party of the Sadducees made use of the change in the proconsulship in 62 or 63 A.D. to have James stoned to death, against the will of the Pharisees. It is, however, strongly suspected that this passage of Josephus is an interpolation (Zahn, ut sup. vi. 301 sqq.). On the other hand, the date given by Hegesippus is supported by the pseudo-Clementine literature, according to which James survived Peter, and also by the Chronicon Paschale (p. 592), and therefore is to be preferred.

3. His Life and Work.

II. The Epistle of James: This bears a title in the opening verse which names the writer and those for whom it was destined. To see in this only the dedication to a dogmatic writing, or a homily, is counter-indicated by the formal salutation common in Greek letters. Neither should it be assumed that this epistolary form only served the literary fiction of an unknown writer, nor that it is a title added to the writing about 200 A.D., since in both cases the author would probably have been called an apostle. Therefore, the words in the title " to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad " may well be used to determine the first readers. This expression, however, " the twelve tribes " is so specifically national and Israelitic that it can not be referred even figuratively to all Christianity. According to the title, therefore, the Epistle is addressed to the whole Jewish people outside of Palestine. This designation of the readers is limited, however, by the statement that the writer calls himself " a servant of the Lord Jesus Christ "; therefore he assumes that his readers recognize the authority of Jesus. Those readers are therefore neither Jewish and Gentile Christians nor Christians of Jewish and Gentile descent nor principally Gentile Christians; and just as little are they Jewish Christians within or without Palestine: they are Jewish Christians living outside of Palestine. They can, therefore, only be called the twelve tribes in the dispersion in the sense that they were the true Israel so far as it existed outside the Holy Land. These Jewish Christians living outside of Palestine

1. The Readers.

are not to be sought only in one place or in one limited district; indeed, the generalness and fulness of the expression "the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad" render it certain that all Jewish Christians living outside of Palestine were meant, and make it extremely probable that there already were such far and wide. The inferences from the title are not refuted by the letter itself, but partly confirmed. It is not justifiable to cite the silence of the author regarding the Law, the temple, and the unbelieving members of his race against the Jewish origin of the readers, because he is not altogether silent concerning the Law (ii. 8 sqq.) and had no occasion to speak of the temple and unbelieving Jews. That the readers are Christians and not Jews is to be seen from ii. 1, and the whole tone of the Epistle is opposed to a narrow local limitation of the circle of readers. In this epistle, not only is there no personal relation whatever between the writer and the readers, no special salutation, etc., but the conditions referred to are of a very general character. It is not, therefore, justifiable, because the conditions treated of in the Epistle of James appear to point more to Palestine than to the diaspora, to assume that the Epistle was originally addressed to the community of Jerusalem and was later sent to communities outside of Palestine. The Epistle of James is therefore not in the true sense of the word a letter, but rather an address in the form of a circular letter to all Jewish Christians within the pale of Christianity, which was already quite widely disseminated.

2. Aim, Contents, and Style.

What, however, the author recognizes as fundamental in the spiritual condition of his readers is the worldliness and superficiality of their Christianity. With the multifarious sufferings (i. 2) and the delay in the second coming of Christ (v. 7–8) they began to lose patience and their hearts were divided between God and the world (i. 7). Alongside of flattery to the rich, there is contempt for the poor (ii. 1 sqq.), there is also bitterness against the former (iv. 11, v. 9). Alongside of the prayer for means to satisfy their pleasures (iv. 3), there is impious security on the part of the well-to-do (iv. 13 sqq.). Stress is laid upon the profession of faith (ii. 14), which was a subject of wrangling and dispute, and every one was eager to impart instruction (chap. iii.); but there were few signs of application of faith to practical life. These conditions are not to be derived from Judaism so much as from a stagnation of the spiritual life succeeding to a period of loving enthusiasm. The aim and contents correspond to these spiritual conditions of the readers. After an exhortation to be steadfast and prudent in trials, there follows the lesson that the temptation to fail in the hour of trial proceeds from man's own sinful inclinations, not from God, the giver of all good, the author of regeneration by the word of truth (i. 13–18), and to this is attached the admonition to assimilate this word of truth in a humble and obedient spirit (i. 19–27). Later on there are special warnings against the errors and faults named above. The conclusion consists of various brief admonitions, v. 12–20. The simple style of the letter suits its practical contents admirably, following the method of the didactic writings of the Old Testament, in which the single proverbs are strung together in groups like rows of pearls. Instead of the precision of Paul's keen, logical thinking, there is found more rhetorical amplification. The Greek is comparatively pure, although there are not a few Hebraisms. While this Gospel is designated as a law, it is yet the perfect law of liberty (i. 25), not, like the law of the Old Testament, a heavy yoke but to be engrafted in the heart (i. 21), so that man, by his own initiative, responds to the divine will. Inasmuch as the Gospel is essentially identical with the law of the Old Testament, everything that concerns the person of the mediator of the new revelation is placed in the background, even the name of Christ is mentioned only twice, and the synoptic concepts of the Son of Man and the kingdom of heaven are lacking. Nevertheless, the moral teachings of Jesus, principally those of the Sermon on the Mount, are much more freely used than in any other writing of the New Testament. Therefore this epistle is somewhat in disaccord with the Apostle Paul, whose attention is directed more to that side of the Gospel which is in opposition to the Law. It has even been held that ii. 21, 24 (cf. with Rom. iii. 28, iv. 2; Gal. ii. 16) is in irreconcilable opposition to Paul; indeed, that it shows a conscious polemic against him. This difficulty can not be avoided by assuming that the Epistle of James was earlier than the Pauline epistles which contain the divergent propositions, which would not affect the objective difference; indeed the suspicion of conscious contradiction would merely be transferred from James to Paul. But this view of the chronological relation of the writings of Paul and James is untenable, for there is no indication that the formula "to be justified by faith" or the use of the passage Gen. xv. 6 in support of this, was common, as is assumed in this epistle, on the part of its readers. Indeed it remains doubtful whether the Epistle of James is intended to combat the standpoint of the Pauline epistles. In any case this epistle is in accord with Paul in what it really endeavors to prove, that is, that faith without works can not bring salvation (cf. II Cor. v. 10), and that a faith which does not find expression in moral conduct is utterly worthless (I Cor. xiii. 2). Paul regards works as unimportant for justification, while James looks upon works as a condition of justification. While Paul would not have said that there was a justification by the works of faith in the sense of the Epistle of James, because he has a stricter conception of what constitutes conduct well-pleasing to God, his idea of a moral righteousness of believers is approximately that of the Epistle of James. Therefore, there is, if not perfect agreement on this point between James and Paul, at least only an unessential and not an irreconcilable opposition in principle. It is generally recognized that the polemic of the Epistle of James is only directed against a distorted and one-sided Paulinism. The opinion that this epistle was designed to attack Paul's teaching, though unsuccessfully, is without foundation. What is combated is not any doctrine in itself, but only a false standard of conduct. It denounces a lack of moral application of faith, dependent upon a formalizing of Christianity and palliated by a misuse of Pauline doctrine.

3. Date, Canonicity, and Reception.

These results show that the epistle should be placed in a relatively late period of the Apostolic Age when the Church had attained a considerable extent and Christian life had lost something of its first fresh vigor. It is not the earliest or even one of the earliest of the New-Testament writings. The synagogue [so the Am. R.V., i. 2] is not a Jewish one, as though a common use of the synagogue still existed with Jews and Christians; it is a meeting-place for Christians, which they control (ii. 3). The conception of the imminence of the Parousia (v. 8) appears even beyond the Apostolic Age. That the Epistle of James only addresses Jewish Christians does not prove that there were not also Gentile Christians, and if it contains more passages recalling the sayings of Jesus than any other of the Apostolic epistles, that is to be attributed to its theological character, and perhaps to the employment of written sources. Its use in the Church begins at an early period. It is probably cited in I Peter, in I Clement, in the Shepherd of Hermas, and by Justin Martyr. It was certainly used by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Dionysius of Alexandria, Cyril of Jerusalem, Didymus, and Ephraem, and it was also included in the Peshito version. Origen, who is the first to cite it expressly as a writing of James, the Lord's brother, looks upon it as uncanonical; Eusebius counts it among the *antilegomena,* and Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected it. Jerome says it was regarded as pseudonymous in the Latin Church, but he includes it among the canonical books, and his influence and Augustine's assured its acceptance as canonical. This view was not disputed until Erasmus expressed certain doubts. Luther thought it a "right strawy epistle" (*recht stroherne Epistel*), written by a certain pious man, and Cajetan expressed doubts as to its authenticity. Calvin defended it, but Luther's views were accepted by the Magdeburg Centuriators and by some Lutheran dogmatists, as well as by the Calvinist Wetstein. In modern times the opposition to its authenticity was begun by De Wette and Schleiermacher. Naturally no use could be made of the title in the debate as to the origin of the epistle on the assumption that it was added at a later period in order to gain for the epistle (really the work of an unknown author) acceptance in the canon through a title bearing the name of an apostle. Still less tenable is the hypothesis that the epistle, apart from the two (assumed as interpolated) mentions of Christ (i. 1 and ii. 1), was the work of an unknown Jew. The method of interpolation assumed is devoid of motive and without analogy. The introduction of Christian ideas into Jewish writings bearing the name of highly revered Jews is often met, but is entirely different from the attempt assumed here, to make the author of a Jewish writing appear to be a Christian. Besides this, much in the Epistle of James is clearly Christian, apart from the two supposed additions (i. 18–21, 25, ii. 8, 12, 14–26). If, then, "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ," was originally named as author of the epistle, there can be no doubt who is to be understood thereby. James, the son of Zebedee, of whom Jäger (*Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie,* 1878) thinks as the author, was no longer living in the period after the beginning of Paul's mission (Acts xii. 2); James Alphæus withdraws entirely into the background in this time, and either of them would have been designated as an apostle. The only James who is prominent in this period and needed no more precise designation is James, the Lord's brother, the head of the community of Jerusalem. And there are no imperative grounds for refusing to ascribe the epistle to him. The vacillation in the traditions of the early church as to the canonical acceptance of the epistle is explained by the facts that James was not an apostle; that he became the patron-saint of the Ebionites, and that the epistle seemed to contain a polemic against Paul. The author appears rather to have been a man of a practical turn of mind, pious and prayerful, who does not fail to recognize the essential superiority of the Gospel over the Law, but who, nevertheless, emphasizes the relationship of the morality of the former to that of the latter. All this perfectly suits James, the Lord's brother, as known through the New Testament and Hegesippus. It may therefore be assumed that James, the Lord's brother, wrote this pastoral letter in Palestine for the Jewish Christians outside of Palestine, at a time when the activity of Paul had ceased, either because of his captivity, or his death. For the Protevangelium of James see APOCRYPHA, B, I., 1.

F. SIEFFERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the general topic consult: *DB*, ii. 540–548; *EB*, ii. 2317–26. On the three Jameses consult the histories of the Apostolic Age, e.g., Schaff, *Christian Church*, i. 199 sqq., 265 sqq., 272 sqq., et passim; A. C. McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, passim, New York, 1897. The question of the relationship of the third James to Jesus is discussed in *DB*, i. 320–326; by J. B. Lightfoot in his Commentary on Galatians, in a special section; in the Introduction to Mayor's Commentary on James (see below); in F. W. Farrar, *Early Days of Christianity*, chap. xix., London, 1884; in Schegg's commentary (see below); and often in the other commentaries. Consult also W. Patrick, *James the Lord's Brother*, Edinburgh, 1906. For the questions concerning the authenticity, date, contents, etc., of the epistle consult in general the works on Introduction to the New Testament—especially those of Jülicher, 1894, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1904; T. Zahn, 1900; and B. W. Bacon, 1900—and those on New-Testament theology, especially that of Beyschlag, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1896. Works on special topics are: W. G. Schmidt, *Lehregehalt des Jakobusbriefes*, Leipsic, 1869; P. J. Gloag, *Introduction to the Catholic Epistles*, Edinburgh, 1887; W. C. van Manen, in *ThT*, xxviii (1894), 478–496; A. H. Cullen, *Teaching of James; Studies in the Ethics of the Epistle of James*, London, 1904; M. Meinertz, *Der Jakobusbrief und sein Verfasser*, Freiburg, 1905.

Of commentaries on the epistle the best for English readers is by J. B. Mayor, London, 1897. Others which may be mentioned are: W. Augusti, Lemgo, 1801; J. W. Greshof, Essen, 1830; M. Schneckenburger, Stuttgart, 1832; G. W. Theile, Leipsic, 1833; C. R. Jachmann, ib. 1838; F. H. Kern, Tübingen, 1838; C. A. Scharling, Copenhagen, 1841; C. E. Cellérier, Geneva, 1850; A. Neander, Eng. transl., New York, 1852; A. Wiesinger, Königsberg, 1854; De Wette, Leipsic, 1865; F. Graupp, Breslau, 1861; R. Wardlaw, Edinburgh, 1862; H. Boumann, Utrecht, 1865; A. H. Blom, Dort, 1869; H. Ewald, Göttingen, 1870; J. C. C. Hoffmann, Nördlingen, 1875; H. Alford, *Greek Testament*, vol. iv., London, 1877; E. H.

Plumptre, in *Cambridge Bible*, Cambridge, 1878; J. T. Demarest, New York, 1879; D. Erdmann, Berlin, 1888; K. F. Keil, Leipsic, 1883; P. Schegg, Munich, 1883; W. Beyschlag, Göttingen, 1888; A. F. Manoury, Bar-le-Duc, 1888; C. F. Deems, New York, 1889; E. T. Winkler, Philadelphia, 1889; A. Plummer, in *Expositor's Bible*, London, 1891; B. Weiss, in *TU*, viii. 2 (1892); P. Feine, Eisenach, 1893; J. Adderley, London, 1900; W. H. Bennett, in *Century Bible*, ib. 1901; C. A. Bigg, ib. 1902; C. Brown, ib. 1906; F. J. Taylor, *Fourteen Addresses*, ib. 1907.

JAMES, SAINT, OF COMPOSTELLA, ORDER OF: A military order, founded in 1161, as the Knights of St. James of the Sword (*de Spada*), by Pedro Fernandez of Fuente Encalada, in the diocese of Astorga, Spain, united in 1170 with the Canons of San Loyo (St. Eligius) of Compostella. Toward the end of the century it was confirmed by Pope Celestine III. In purpose and character the order was like those of Alcantara and Calatrava (qq.v.), but it never equaled them in importance. It came to an end in 1835. See COMPOSTELLA.

(O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. Giucci, *Iconografia storica degli ordini religiosi e cavallereschi*, i. 96–100, Rome, 1836; P. B. Gams, *Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, iii., 1, p. 56, Regensburg, 1876; Currier, *Religious Orders*, p. 217.

JAMES, JOHN ANGELL: English Congregationalist; b. at Blandford Forum (17 m. n.e. of Dorchester, Dorset) June 6, 1785; d. at Birmingham Oct. 1, 1859. After serving four years as an apprentice to a linen-draper at Poole, Dorset, he entered the theological academy at Gosport in 1802, and qualified under the Toleration Act as a dissenting preacher the following year. He was called to Carr's Lane Chapel, Birmingham, in 1805, and ordained pastor there early the following year. He remained in this pastorate till his death. He was chairman of the board of education of Spring Hill College, Birmingham (now Mansfield College, Oxford), from 1838 till his death; and in 1846 he was one of the chief promoters of the Evangelical Alliance. He was held in high esteem as a preacher and author, and as a public man. Though a Calvinist in creed, he laid more stress on Christian duty than on doctrinal niceties. He published numerous single sermons and addresses and a dozen small volumes, of which the best known are *Christian Charity* (London, 1828); and *The Anxious Enquirer after Salvation* (Birmingham, 1834), which was widely circulated in England and America and translated into Welsh, Gaelic, and Malagasy. Other writings by James will be found in his *Works* (17 vols., London, 1860–64).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: James's *Autobiography* was published as the last volume of the *Works*, ut sup. Consult also: J. Campbell, *Review of J. A. James' History and Character*, London, 1859; R. W. Dale, *Life and Letters of John Angell James*, ib. 1861; *DNB*, xxix. 215–217.

JAMES, MONTAGUE RHODES: Church of England; b. at Livermere (6 m. n.e. of Bury St. Edmund's), Suffolk, Aug. 1, 1862. He studied at King's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1885), and in 1903 was appointed Sanders Reader in bibliography. Since 1905 he has been provost of King's College, and is also director of the Fitzwilliam Museum. He has written or edited *Psalms of Solomon* (in collaboration with H. E. Ryle; Cambridge, 1891); *Testament of Abraham* (in collaboration with W. E. Barnes; 1892); *The Gospel according to Peter and the Revelation of Peter* (in collaboration with J. A. Robinson; London, 1892); *Apocrypha Anecdota* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1893–97); *On the Abbey of St. Edmund at Bury* (1895); *The Life and Miracles of St. William of Norwich* (in collaboration with A. Jessopp, 1896); *Sources of Archbishop Parker's Collection of Manuscripts* (1899); *Verses in the Windows of Canterbury Cathedral* (1901); *Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (1904); and *Ghost Stories of an Antiquary* (1904); as well as descriptive catalogues of the manuscripts (especially western) in the libraries of Eton College (Cambridge, 1895), the Fitzwilliam Museum (1895), and Lambeth Palace (1900), and of the following Cambridge colleges: Jesus (1895), King's (1895), Sidney Sussex (1895), Peterhouse (1899), Trinity (4 vols., 1900–05), Emmanuel (1904), Pembroke (1905), Christ's (1905), Clare (1906), Queen's (1906), Trinity Hall (1907), and Gonville and Caius (2 vols., 1907–08).

JAMES, WILLIAM: American psychologist and philosopher; b. in New York Jan. 11, 1842. He studied in private schools, then at the Lawrence Scientific School and the Harvard Medical School (M.D., 1869). He has taught at Harvard since 1876, having been instructor in philosophy 1872–76, assistant professor of anatomy and physiology 1876–80, assistant professor of philosophy 1880–85, professor of philosophy 1885–89, professor of psychology 1889–97, and professor of philosophy again since 1897. He holds a position in the front rank of modern psychologists, and in this field has exercised a potent influence both in Europe and America. In philosophy he represents what may be called empirical idealism as opposed to absolute idealism. His works have been widely translated, and are characterized by keen analysis, apt illustration, lucid exposition, and a charm of style rarely encountered in works on philosophy. He has published *The Principles of Psychology* (2 vols., New York, 1890); *Psychology—Briefer Course* (1892); *The Will to Believe, and Other Essays in Popular Philosophy* (1897); *Human Immortality: Two Supposed Objections to the Doctrine* (Boston, 1898); *Talks to Students on Psychology, and to Teachers on Some of Life's Ideals* (New York, 1899); *Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature* (1902), Gifford Lectures delivered at Edinburgh 1900–01, a work which has attracted much attention, and establishes his claim to mention in a religious encyclopedia; *Pragmatism: A New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking* (1907); and *Pluralistic Universe* (Hibbert *Lectures;* 1909). In 1908 a volume of *Essays Philosophical and Psychological* was published in his honor in New York.

JAMESON, jē′me-sun, **ANNA BROWNELL:** English authoress; b. in Dublin, Ireland, May 17, 1794; d. at Ealing (9 m. w. of St. Paul's, London), Middlesex, Mar. 17, 1860. She was the daughter of Denis Brownell Murphy, an Irish miniature-painter, who came to England in 1798 and settled with his family at London in 1803. After spending a number of years as governess in the family of the marquis of Winchester, and in other noted families, she contracted an unhappy marriage with Robert Jameson, a young barrister, in 1825. She practically separated from her husband in 1829, when he went to Dominica as puisne judge. In 1836 she joined him in Canada, where he had secured, through her influence, an important legal appointment in 1833, but left him after six months, though she did not return to England till 1838. In the course of her literary work she spent much time in France, Italy, and Germany. Her most important work is *Sacred and Legendary Art*, in four sections, *Legends of the Saints* (2 vols., London, 1848), *Legends of the Monastic Orders as Represented in the Fine Arts* (1850), *Legends of the Madonna as Represented in the Fine Arts* (1852), and *The History of Our Lord as Exemplified in Works of Art* (2 vols., 1864), which was completed by Lady Eastlake. Other works deserving mention are the popular *Diary of an Ennuyée* (1826); the excellent *Characteristics of Women* (2 vols., 1832), essays on Shakespeare's heroines dedicated to Fanny Kemble; *Visits and Sketches* (4 vols., 1834), a charming work; *Winter Studies and Summer Rambles in Canada* (3 vols., 1838); and *Memoirs and Essays* (1846). In her later life Mrs. Jameson became interested in the work of Sisters of Charity and wrote *Sisters of Charity* (1855) and *The Communion of Labour* (1856).

Bibliography: G. Macpherson, *Memoirs of the Life of Anna Jameson*, London, 1878; *DNB*, xxix. 230–232.

JANNES AND JAMBRES: The names given in II Tim. iii. 8 to the adversaries of Moses, who opposed their magic to his miracles, but were overcome by him (Ex. vii. 11 sqq.). Paul derived the names from Jewish tradition. Jambres appears in the forms *Yambris, Yombros;* the Talmudists write it *mamre'* and *mamrey*, "the rebel." *Jannes* appears as *Yannis* and *Yonos*, and in the Talmud as *Yoḥannan* (*Yohanne*). Buxtorf and Levy consider this last to be the original form; but the analogy of Jambres suggests that it also had an adjectival quality expressing a hostile character and that it was later confounded with the usual name Johannes. The names probably read *Yani we Yamri*, Aram. *Yanne we Yamre*, "he who seduces and he who makes rebellious."

Jewish tradition makes them sons of Balaam (Targum of Jonathan on Num. xxii. 22), and places their rise at the time the Pharaoh gave command to kill the first-born of Israel (*Sanhedrin*, f. 106a; *Soṭah* 11a), and supposes them to have been teachers of Moses, the makers of the golden calf (Midrash Tanḥuma, f. 115b), and to have accompanied their father Balaam.

These names were doubtless familiar to the apostle educated in the school of Gamaliel, and they seem also to have been well known in the heathen world. Origen and Ambrose mention an apocryphal book about Jannes and Mambres (see Pseudepigrapha, Old Testament, II., 37). The Pythagorean Numenius (second century) knew of the two Egyptian magi (Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica*, ix. 8), Apuleius had heard of them (*Apologia*, ii.). The two names occur in the Gospel of Nicodemus (chap. v.), in the *Martyrium Petri et Pauli* (chap. xxxiv.; R. A. Lipsius, *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, Leipsic, 1891, pp. 148–149), in the *Acta Petri et Pauli* (chap. lv.; Lipsius, ut sup. p. 202), and elsewhere. The apostle has been blamed for employing so unimportant a tradition, but may be justified by the resemblance between these men and the false teachers of II Tim. iii. 6 sqq.

C. von Orelli.

Bibliography: Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 292–294, Eng. transl., II., iii. 149–150. The forms are discussed in the lexicons; e.g.: J. Buxtorf, ed. of Basel, 1639, pp. 945 sqq.; J. C. Suicerus, *Thesaurus ecclesiasticus*, s. v. "Iannēs"; J. A. Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti*, i. 813 sqq., Hamburg, 1723; *DB*, ii. 549; *EB*, ii. 2327–29; *JE*, vii. 71.

JANOW, yā′nef, **MATTHIAS OF:** The first of the so-called precursors of Huss; d. in Prague Nov. 30, 1394. He descended from a noble Bohemian family and studied theology in Prague and Paris, where he remained nine years, to which was due his title of *magister Parisiensis*. In 1381 he was appointed canon in the cathedral of St. Vitus in Prague and confessor. He was not a great preacher, but exercised influence through his pastoral labors and writings. He considered that the abuses of the Church started from the papal schism, and that they could be healed only by moral renovation. Therefore he was intent upon church reform. In his writings he addressed himself to the common people. The reforms which he advocated were the abolition of all human additions to Christianity (doctrinal and ceremonial), and a return of believers to the love of Jesus and the simple foundation on which rested the Apostolic Church. He laid special stress on frequent communion, since he regarded the Lord's Supper as the most important means for spiritual growth, and emphasized the common priesthood of believers. He was a diligent student of the Bible and wrote from 1388 to 1392 various treatises which he later collected under the title *Regulae veteris et novi testamenti*. Parts of this work were erroneously ascribed to Huss and embodied in the Nuremberg collection of his works (vol. i., pp. 376–471). (J. Loserth.)

Bibliography. J. P. Jordan, *Die Vorläufer des Hussitentums in Böhmen*, Leipsic, 1846; F. Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, iii. 1, pp. 173 sqq., Prague, 1851; idem, *Documenta Joannis Hus*, pp. 699 sqq., ib. 1869 (the retractation of Janow); E. H. Gillett, *Life and Times of John Hus*, pp. 26 sqq., Philadelphia, 1870; A. H. Wratislaw, *John Hus*, pp. 61 sqq., London, 1882; J. Loserth, *Wiclif and Hus*, ib. 1889; Count Lützow, *John Hus*, pp. 3–60, ib. 1909.

JANSEN, CORNELIUS, JANSENISM.

Origin of Movement (§ 1).
Cornelius Jansen (§ 2).
Jansenism Condemned by Pope (§ 3).
Arnauld and Pascal (§ 4).
Quesnel. The Bull *Unigenitus* (§ 5).
Acceptants and Appellants (§ 6).
Convolutionists (§ 7).
Close of Controversies (§ 8).

1. Origin of Movement.

The religious movement known as Jansenism originated in the controversy on the doctrine of grace. It divided the Roman Catholic Church of France for over a century and developed a puritanical and separatist spirit in many ways analogous to that of French Calvinism. Since the writings of Augustine, after Paul, chiefly determined the belief of both Luther and Calvin, the Counter-Reformation was driven into an attitude of practical, though veiled, hostility toward his special teachings. They had had a powerful influence in the Middle Ages on the mystics and the scholastics, which left its mark on the Thomistic theology of the Dominican order. At the Council of Trent, in regard to the doctrines of grace and of sin, they opposed the Scotist tendency toward semi-Pelagianism exemplified in the Franciscans and Jesuits. These latter, however, were victorious in the main, and soon boldly developed their deductions from the concessions made to them. The Pauline and Augustinian doctrine was now upheld especially by Michael Bajus (q.v.), professor of Louvain. The Franciscans obtained the condemnation of seventy-six of his propositions in 1567 and 1579. When the Jesuit Molina in 1588 taught semi-Pelagianism, the Dominicans brought serious charges against him. In order to settle the dispute between the two orders, Clement VIII. convoked in 1597 a *congregatio de auxiliis* to define decisively the relation of grace to conversion, but it was dissolved in 1607 by Paul V. As the gulf between the Roman Catholic Church and the churches of the Reformation became wider, the spirit of semi-Pelagianism in life and doctrine assumed larger dimensions in the Roman Catholic Church, and as Thomism degenerated into a lifeless scholasticism, it is not strange that the doctrine of Augustine became, in 1612, a new revelation for two young and zealous students of the University of Louvain, Cornelius Jansen and Duvergier de Hauranne, afterward abbé of St. Cyran (see DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE).

2. Cornelius Jansen.

Cornelius Jansen (b. at Acquoy in North Holland Oct. 28, 1585; d. at Ypres [66 m. w. of Brussels, Belgium] May 6, 1638) studied theology at the college of Adrian VI. in Louvain, where he formed an intimate acquaintance with Duvergier. He declined a position as teacher of philosophy, hating Aristotle as the father of scholasticism, and believing Plato's ideas of God and virtue superior to those of some Roman Catholic theologians. As president of the college of St. Pulcheria he taught theology. By continually reading the writings of Augustine, Jansen came to the conviction that the Roman Catholic theologians of both parties had deviated from the doctrine of the primitive Church, and in 1621 he resolved, with his friend Duvergier, to work for reform. For this purpose he entered into intimate connections with prominent Irish divines, and with the leaders of the new French Congregation of the Oratory. At his instigation, the University of Louvain excluded Jesuits from positions as teachers, and, in behalf of the university, he undertook journeys to Madrid, in 1623 and 1627, with reference to certain encroachments of the Jesuits. In 1630 he was appointed regius professor of Holy Scripture in Louvain, and in 1636 bishop of Ypres. He laid down the results of his studies of Augustine in his comprehensive work, *Augustinus, seu doctrina Sancti Augustini de humanae naturae sanitate, aegritudine, medicina adversus Pelagianos et Massilienses* (3 vols., Louvain, 1640). The first volume gives a historical exposition of the semi-Pelagian heresies; the second sets forth the Augustinian doctrine as to the state of innocence and the fall; while the third treats of the grace of Christ and of predestination in the spirit of Augustine. While the work was still in the press at Louvain, strenuous efforts were made by the Jesuit party there, through the papal nuncio at Cologne, to prohibit its appearance, but in vain. It was immediately reprinted in Paris and Rouen. The bull *In eminenti* (1642) reproached Jansen for the renewal of the heresies of Bajus, but he had then been dead for four years. It was only after a resistance of several years on the part of bishops, universities, and provincial estates that the bull was published in the Spanish Netherlands and its subscription enforced.

3. Jansenism Condemned by Pope.

The leader of the Jansenist party after the death of Jansen and Duvergier was Antoine Arnauld (see ARNAULD), the learned doctor of the Sorbonne, who, in 1643, published *De la fréquente communion* on the basis of the doctrine of predestination as taught by Augustine and Jansen. At the same time the Jesuits were eagerly at work to effect the condemnation of the Jansenist principles, being aided in their efforts by the French Dominicans, while the Dominicans of Spain and Italy took the part of Jansen. The University of Louvain requested the assistance of the Sorbonne in repelling the encroachments of the Jesuits and preventing the condemnation of Jansen's doctrines. As no particular doctrines of Jansen had been condemned as heretical in the papal bull, the Jesuits attempted to formulate, in the shape of definite propositions, the heresy of which they accused him. These were finally reduced to five, and in 1650 forwarded to Rome. They are as follows: (1) Some commandments of God are impossible of execution by the just, and the grace by which they might be truly fulfilled is lacking; (2) in the state of fallen nature inward grace is never resisted; (3) in the fallen state merit and demerit do not depend on a liberty which excludes internal necessity; freedom from external constraint suffices; (4) the semi-Pelagians admitted the necessity of an inward prevenient grace for the performance of every (good) act, even for the first act of faith; their heresy consisted in their assertion that this grace was of such a nature that the will of man was able either to resist or to obey it; (5) it is semi-Pelagian to say that Christ died or shed his blood for all men without exception. Pope Innocent X. condemned these theses in 1653 in the bull *Cum occasione.* Although this bull was confirmed neither by the assembly of the clergy nor by parliament, it was sent to the different dioceses for subscription, at the instigation of the Jesuits. The Jansenists declared their willingness to condemn the five theses in their heretical sense, but not as propositions of Jansen. Most of the Jansenists admitted the infallibility of the pope in matters of faith, but not as to facts of merely human knowledge. In 1654 the pope declared that these condemned theses were really in Jansen's *Augustinus,* and that their condemnation as the teaching of Jansen would have to be subscribed on pain of deprivation. Under these circumstances hundreds of the "party of grace" signed the condemnation.

4. Arnauld and Pascal.

In 1654 a priest at St. Sulpice, in Paris, refused absolution to the duke of Liancourt because of his protection of a priest who had refused subscription. Thereupon Antoine Arnauld (q.v.) published his *Lettre à une personne de qualité*, from which two propositions were immediately extracted by his opponents: (1) The grace of God, without which we can not do anything good, had left Peter at the time when he denied the Lord; (2) since not everybody can convince himself that the five condemned theses are in Jansen, a submission of respectful silence under the papal decision suffices; the submission of faith can not be required for the fact. Arnauld was expelled from the Sorbonne (1656), and eighty doctors went out with him rather than sign his excommunication. At this time Blaise Pascal (q.v.) sent forth his *Lettres à un provincial*, in the first of which he attacked the Thomists for opposing the teachings of Jansen and Arnauld, while they themselves, according to him, with their mechanical view of predestination, really shared their views. In the following letters he attacked the casuistry and moral theology of the Jesuits. But Louis XIV. was intent upon thoroughly eradicating Jansenism. In 1660, at an assembly of the French clergy, a formulary was prepared which condemned the five propositions of Jansen, and subscription was again required not only from the clergy, but now from nuns as well. Those who refused were imprisoned, De Sacy, one of the most excellent men of the Port Royal group, in the Bastile. Arnauld insisted upon the distinction between *fait* and *droit*, though in 1656 Alexander VII., in the constitution *Ad sanctam beati Petri sedem*, had again laid down the "fact" that Jansen had taught the five theses in an objectionable sense. In 1664 he issued a new constitution in which he required all clergy to accept by a new signature the papal pronouncements of 1642, 1653, and 1656. Four bishops would promise no more as to the fact, and a number of others signed with reservations intended to protect the doctrine of Augustine. The strength of the opposition impressed both the Curia and the king. After some hesitation, the distinction between *fait* and *droit* and the possibility of a "respectful silence" was admitted by Pope Clement IX. in 1668, and thus a temporary peace was established. This "peace of Clement IX." was evidently a defeat for the Curia, which practically admitted that the situation was beyond its control unless it was supported by the secular arm.

5. Quesnel. The Bull Unigenitus.

The dissensions were revived by the publication of Quesnel's *Nouveau Testament en français avec des reflexions morales* (1693), which was dedicated to Noailles, at that time bishop of Châlons. But before the development of this new stage, Jansenism of the older period had come to an end. Louis XIV. became more and more jealous of his authority and inclined to assure the pardon of his sins by the persecution of heretics. He availed himself of a dissension which had broken out among the Jansenists themselves, by urging Pope Clement XI. to adopt severe measures against them. The pope was glad to seize an opportunity to assert his authority over the Gallican Church, and issued the bull *Vineam Domini* (1705) in which the five theses of Jansen were unconditionally condemned. The nuns of Port Royal refused to subscribe the bull, and their convent was suppressed in 1709 and destroyed a year later. In the mean time Cardinal de Noailles had become archbishop of Paris. By his protection of Quesnel's "New Testament" he had incurred the hatred of the Jesuits, who influenced the pope to condemn certain propositions which Le Tellier, the Jesuit confessor of the king, had selected from the New Testament of Quesnel. Thereupon the pope issued, in 1713, the bull *Unigenitus*, in which 101 propositions from Quesnel were condemned as Jansenistic or otherwise heretical. Among these, however, were not only some which may be found almost literally in Holy Scripture and in Augustine, but even some substantially identical with the decrees of the Council of Trent, as, for instance, the second, "The grace of Jesus Christ is necessary for all good works; without it nothing (truly good) can be done"; the twenty-sixth, "No grace is imparted except through faith"; the twenty-ninth, "Outside of the Church no grace is given"; and the fifty-first, "Faith justifies when it is operative, but it is operative only through love." The bull was laid before the assembly of the French clergy and accepted by the majority. Noailles prohibited the book; but before he accepted the bull, he asked the pope for several explanations. The parliament obeyed the order of the king to enter the bull in the laws of the kingdom, with the reservation, however, that its views regarding excommunication should not interfere with loyalty to the king. The Sorbonne split into different parties, and some of its most prominent teachers were banished from Paris or lost their right of voting. The king, intolerant of resistance, thought of settling the matter by a national council, but the pope would not hear of so risky a measure; and at his death in 1715, Louis XIV. left the Jansenist question in the greatest confusion and bitterness of feeling.

6. Acceptants and Appellants.

The successor of Louis XIV., the frivolous duke of Orléans, cared for neither party, considering the principles of both equally foolish. The exiles were allowed to return, and the Sorbonne withdrew its half-hearted acceptance of the bull *Unigenitus*. Accordingly, the pope threatened Noailles with deprivation and even excommunication. But now a number of hitherto submissive bishops began to ask for explanations, and in 1717 several of them appealed from the pope and his bull to a future general council. These were called Appellants, in distinction from the Acceptants, who accepted the bull. Almost twenty bishops, the faculty of Paris and two other theological faculties, and a large part of the secular and monastic clergy joined the cause of the Appellants. They were stigmatized as Jansenists by their opponents, though in some cases unjustly. Noailles also took the part of the Appellants, after a vain attempt at mediation. The party of the Acceptants was headed by Mailly, archbishop of Reims. But Dubois, the favorite of the regent, was ambitious of a cardinal's hat, and took sides against the Appellants; and Louis XV., led by his former teacher, Cardinal Fleury, oppressed them in every way. Noailles was compelled to submit (1728), and in 1730 the bull was formally registered as the law of the kingdom.

7. Convolutionists.

A young Jansenist clergyman, François de Pâris, had died in 1727 as a result of his ascetic practises, with his "appeal" in his hand, and some miraculous cures performed at his grave were looked upon as a divine confirmation of the cause of the Appellants; even children fell into convulsions and trances on his grave, prophesying and testifying against the bull. Infidels were carried away by the fanaticism of the thousands who knelt at the grave of Pâris in the churchyard of St. Médard. In 1732 the king ordered the graveyard to be closed; but portions of earth which had been taken from the grave were equally efficacious, and the number of convulsionary prophets of coming ruin to Church and State continued to increase until the movement ended in strife, and sometimes in moral disorder, after giving occasion to the skeptics to draw conclusions unfavorable to the miracles of Christianity.

8. Close of Controversies.

The Jansenists of the first generation had endeavored to enforce the practise of confession to the parish priest, not to friars and Jesuits, but the subsequent persecution compelled them to confess to appellant priests. On their death-bed, however, they had to confess to their regular pastor if they wished to be buried with the rites of the Church. Under the influence of the Jesuits, Beaumont, archbishop of Paris, resolved to refuse the last rites of the Church to all those who produced no evidence that they had confessed when in health to their parish priest. When a priest in 1752 accordingly refused absolution to an Appellant, the archbishop was summoned before parliament and threatened with confiscation of his revenues. Most of the bishops took the side of the archbishop, in defense of the unrestricted right of the Church to control the sacraments, while other parliaments took sides with that of Paris, on the ground that it was trying to protect citizens against clerical oppression. In 1753 the king forbade the parliament to meddle in ecclesiastical affairs, and its members were dispersed and banished; but in the following year they were recalled, although they still insisted upon their rights, and the archbishop who still refused absolution to Appellants was exiled. The bishops, supported by the king, requested the decision of the pope, who now manifested considerably more caution in regard to the bull *Unigenitus* by refusing the sacraments only to such Appellants as were recognized as such publicly and by law. The king referred grievances concerning the refusal of the sacraments to spiritual courts, but with the right of appeal to secular courts. The dissensions of Jansenism ceased only with the excitement preceding the expulsion of the Jesuits. The literature on these disputes from the time of the bull *Unigenitus* comprises three or four thousand volumes in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris.

(PAUL TSCHACKERT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best earlier literature is given in Schaff, *Creeds*, i. 102. Consult: T. Bouvier, *Hist. du Jansénisme*, Strasburg, 1864; S. P. Tregelles, *The Jansenists; their Rise, Persecutions and existing Fragments*, London, 1851; R. F. W. Guettée, *Jansénisme et Jésuitisme*, Paris, 1857; R. Rapin, *Hist. du Jansénisme*, Paris, 1865; idem, *Mémoires sur l'église 1644–99*, ed. L. Aubineau, 3 vols., ib. 1865; F. X. Linsenmann, *M. Bains und die Grundlegung des Jansenismus*, Tübingen, 1867; W. H. Jervis, *The Gallican Church*, i. chaps. xi.–xiv., ii. chaps. v. vi., viii., 2 vols., London, 1872; A. Schill, *Die Constitution Unigenitus*, Freiburg, 1876; E. L. T. Henke, *Neuere Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Gass, ii. 97 sqq., Halle, 1878; A. Vandenpeerenboom, *Cornelius Jansenius*, Bruges, 1882; A. Ricard, *Les Premiers Jansénistes*, Paris, 1883; L. Séche, *Les Derniers Jansénistes, 1710–1870*, 3 vols., ib. 1891; C. Gilardoni, *La Bulle Unigenitus*, Vitry-le-François, 1892; idem, *L'Abbaye de Haute-Fontaine et le Jansénisme*, ib. 1894; C. Callewaert, *Jansenius évêque d'Ypres*, Louvain, 1893; Mrs. M. Tollemache, *French Jansenists*, London, 1893; G. Doublet, *Le Jansénisme dans l'ancien diocèse de Vence*, Paris, 1901; J. Gaillard, *Un prélat janséniste. Choart de Buzeuval, évêque de Beauvais, 1651–79*, ib. 1902; A. M. P. Ingold, *Boussuet et le Jansénisme*, ib. 1904; V. Durand, *Le Jansénisme au xviii. siècle et Joachim Colbert, évêque de Montpellier (1696–1738)*, ib. 1907; *Cambridge Modern History*, v. 82 sqq., New York, 1908. The bull Unigenitus is given in Lat. in Reich, Documents, pp. 386–389. The reader should consult also for further light on the subject the literature given under PASCAL, BLAISE; PORT ROYAL; and QUESNEL, PASQUIER.

JANSENIST CHURCH IN HOLLAND.

Contributory Causes of the Schism of 1702 (§ 1).
Its Immediate Occasion (§ 2).
History (§ 3).
Differences from the Roman Catholic Church (§ 4).

1. Contributory Causes of the Schism of 1702.

The doctrines of Jansenism (see JANSEN, CORNELIUS, JANSENISM) left no permanent trace in Belgium or in France, but in Holland there has been for more than two centuries a church popularly called Jansenist. Its adherents reject the name, rightly calling themselves the Old Catholic Church of Holland, since the schism among the Dutch Roman Catholics in 1702, to which they owe their origin, sprang from the adherence of the Dutch clergy to the privileges of their church rather than from dogmatic principles. The first bishop in Holland was Willibrord (q.v.), consecrated bishop of Utrecht by Pope Sergius I. in 695. Among his successors were not a few who opposed the growing tendency to regard the pope as the unrestricted governor of all Christendom. The bishop of Utrecht was originally chosen by the clergy, and in 1145 the Emperor Conrad III. confirmed the right to the chapter of St. Martin's Cathedral. The choice was not always accepted by Rome. In 1559 in accordance with the wish of Philip II. of Spain, then ruler of the Netherlands, the pope elevated Utrecht to the rank of an archbishopric with five suffragan sees, and it was then agreed by pope and king that the latter should select the bishops, to be confirmed by the pope. Nine years later the War of Liberation broke out, lasting for eighty years, and involved the Roman Catholics in many difficulties. Though they joined with the Protestants in fighting against the Spanish yoke, they were mistrusted, and about 1573 the public exercise of Catholic worship was forbidden—a prohibition which remained in force till the revolution of 1795. As the incumbents of the episcopal sees died, it was found difficult to fill their places. Sasbold Vosmeer, chosen general vicar by the Utrecht chapter in 1583, after the death of the archbishop in 1580, was consecrated archbishop by the pope in 1602, but with the title archbishop of Philippi. His successors were chosen and consecrated in the same way. Under the fifth of them, Petrus Codde (consecrated 1689), occurred the schism.

2. Its Immediate Occasion.

More formidable opponents than the Protestants had appeared against the Roman Catholic clergy of Holland. During the turbulent conditions of the long war the country had been invaded by "regular" clergy especially by the Jesuits after 1590, who accused the Dutch clergy of the Jansenistic heresy. In 1697, during the negotiations of peace at Ryswik, there appeared an anonymous treatise in French, soon afterward also in Latin, and some years later in Dutch, under the title "Short Memorial concerning the Condition and Progress of Jansenism in Holland." Some copies fell into the hands of Codde, who hastened to send the book to Rome with an apology. He was declared innocent in Rome, although there was no end of insinuations. Since Alexander VII. had issued his constitution against the so-called five theses of Jansen in 1656, the accusation implied that the accused was suspected of agreeing with the five condemned theses, or of refusing to believe that Jansen had taught those theses in his *Augustinus*, and thereby given rise to the heresy condemned by the church. Codde and his subordinate ecclesiastics could easily defend themselves against the charge of agreeing with the content of the condemned theses, although the former did not express himself on the question whether Jansen had really taught them or not. But since the decision of Alexander, this point involved the absolute supremacy and infallibility of the pope, and the Jesuits were intent upon having this question decided. Codde was summoned to Rome in 1700, and in 1702 was declared guilty of heresy. There was great consternation in Holland when it was learned that he had been dismissed from office, and still more when Theodor de Kock, his opponent, was appointed general vicar. The estates took the part of Codde and forced his opponents to let him return to Holland, where he arrived in 1703. The question now was, what attitude would Codde, the Dutch clergy, and the Utrecht chapter assume. If they accepted Codde's dismissal, the independence of the Utrecht church was necessarily abolished. Codde himself, from love of peace, remained until his death in a passive attitude, stedfastly asserting his rights and those of his church, but refraining from exercising them. A large party of the Dutch clergy and laity, however, remained faithful to him, although another part followed De Kock. Thus Codde's dismissal led to a schism in the Dutch Roman Catholic Church which has never been healed.

3. History.

It was to be expected that the church of the Jansenists, as Codde's party was now called, would decrease in numbers after Rome had spoken. Owing to the lack of higher ecclesiastics, the church of Utrecht was on the point of extinction, when aid came in an unexpected manner. Several French clergymen who refused to sign the bull *Unigenitus* in 1713 (see JANSEN, CORNELIUS, JANSENISM) sought refuge on Dutch soil. Moreover, in 1719, Dom Maria Varlet (chosen bishop of Babylon in 1718 and consecrated as bishop of Ascalon Feb. 19, 1719) spent some time in Amsterdam before he undertook his journey to the Orient. In Amsterdam be hecame acquainted with ecclesiastics of the Old Catholic Church and was active in their behalf. He had hardly reached the Orient when the pope suspended him as a Jansenist. He then returned to Holland, where the Utrecht chapter in 1723 had elected Cornelis Steenoven as archbishop to prevent the extinction of the Old Catholic Church. In 1724 Bishop Varlet consecrated him. The pope, of course, immediately put Steenoven under the ban, but the Utrecht church was saved from extinction. Steenoven died in 1725, and was succeeded by Barchman Wuytiers (d. 1733), who was followed by Theodor van der Croon (d. 1739), both consecrated by Varlet. The Utrecht church soon recognized the danger of making its continuance dependent upon the life of a single bishop, and consequently Hieronymus de Bock was consecrated bishop of Haarlem in 1742, and B. J. Bijevelt bishop of Deventer in 1758. Several attempts to reconcile the pope failed. A serious danger threatened the Old Catholic Church in Holland under the administration of the Roman Catholic king, Louis Bonaparte (1806–10), and under the régime of Emperor Napoleon (1810–13), who contemplated prohibiting the election of a new Old Catholic bishop; but this danger passed with the restitution of the independence of Holland, and in 1814 W. van Os was elected archbishop of Utrecht, and in 1819 Johannes Bon bishop of Haarlem (see EPISCOPACY, III.). The difficulties which threatened the church under King William I. and King William II., who desired to establish a concordat with the pope, passed as soon as the agreement failed. The law concerning church associations enacted in 1853 assured entire freedom to all ecclesiastical organizations, including the Old Catholics. In this way the small church has gradually increased its members from 5,000 to almost 8,000, and its parishes from twenty-five to twenty-six. It is not strange that the Old Catholic bishops disapproved the dogma of the immaculate conception in 1854, and that of papal infallibility in 1870.

4. Differences from the Roman Catholic Church.

The chief points of difference between the Old Catholics of Holland and their Roman Catholic opponents are the following: (1) The Old Catholic Church considers the deposition of Archbishop Codde illegal, and asserts that, in spite of the Reformation of the sixteenth century and its influence upon the affairs of Holland, the Roman Catholic Church has existed without interruption, and has continuously retained its right to administer its own affairs as a national church, independent of the church in Rome. (2) It refuses to sign the formula of Pope Alexander VII., unless permitted to make a distinction between a signature *quoad jus* and *quoad factum;* namely, between the question whether the five incriminated theses were heretical, and the question whether

Jansen had taught them in a heretical sense. (3) It rejects the bull *Unigenitus*, since this bull validates the moral system of the Jesuits for the whole Roman Catholic Church. The importance of the Old Catholic Church of Holland for all Roman Catholic Christendom lies not only in the fact that it is a monument of the spirit of the earlier centuries, but also in the fact that it has entered into relations with the Old Catholic movement in Germany and Switzerland. When the Old Catholic spirit was aroused in Germany in opposition to the dogma of infallibility in 1870, and the necessity of a bishop for the newly organized Old Catholic Church was felt, it was H. Heykamp, the Old Catholic bishop of Deventer, who, in 1873, consecrated J. H. Reinkens bishop of the German Old Catholics. See Old Catholics. (J. A. Gerth van Wijk.)

Bibliography: C. P. Hoynck a Papendrecht, *Hist. ecclesiae Ultrajectinae*, Mechlin, 1725; T. Backhusius, *Bewijs-Schrift*, 3 vols., Utrecht, 1726–30; M. G. Dupac de Bellegarde, *Hist. abrégée de l'église métropolitaine d'Utrecht*, ib. 1852; J. W. Neale, *Hist. of the so-called Jansenist Church of Holland*, London, 1858; R. Bennink Janssonius, *Geschiedenis der Oud-Roomsch-Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*, The Hague, 1870; F. Nippold, *Die römisch-katholische Kirche . . . der Niederlande*, Leipsic, 1877; J. A. van Beek, *Geschiedenis der hollandsche Kerk*, Rotterdam, 1886; *Neerlandia Catholica*, Utrecht, 1888; J. de Huller, *Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis van het Utrechtsche Schisma*, The Hague, 1892; W. P. C. Knuttel, *De Toestand der nederlandsche Katholieken*, 2 vols., ib. 1892–94; J. Meyhoffer, *Le Martyrologe protestant des Pays-Bas, 1423–1597*, The Hague, 1907. The literature of the church is given by J. A. van Beek, *Lijst van boeken uitgeven in de Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 3 vols., Rotterdam, 1892–93. Much of the literature under Jansenism is pertinent, e.g., the work of Tregelles.

JANSSEN, yäns′sen, **JOHANNES:** Roman Catholic; b. at Xanten (15 m. s.e. of Cleves) Apr. 10, 1829; d. at Frankfort Dec. 24, 1891. He studied at Münster, Louvain, Bonn, and Berlin from 1849 to 1853 (Ph.D., Bonn, 1853), and was professor of history in the gymnasium of Frankfort from 1854 until his death. He was ordained to the priesthood in 1860, was a member of the Prussian House of Deputies in 1875–76, was created a domestic prelate to the pope and an apostolic prothonotary in 1880. His theological position was so ultramontanistic as to evoke sharp criticism from Protestant historians for his partizan views of the moral, economic, and religious results of the Reformation. Of his many books the chief is the monumental *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters* (8 vols., Freiburg, 1879–94), the last three edited and completed by L. Pastor; Eng. transl. by M. A. Mitchell and A. M. Christie, *Hist. of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages*, 12 vols., London, 1896–1907; Pastor has also reedited the whole work, and has supervised the publication of a series of monographs in defense of it under the title *Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssens Geschichte des deutschen Volkes* (6 vols., Freiburg, 1898–1908). Janssen replied to his critics in his *An meine Kritiker* (Freiburg, 1882) and *Ein zweites Wort an meine Kritiker* (1883).

Bibliography: L. Pastor, *Johannes Janssen, 1829–91, ein Lebensbild*, Freiburg, 1893; F. Meister, *Erinnerung an Johann Janssen*, Frankfort, 1896.

JANNSENS, ERASMUS (ERASMUS JOHANNES): Dutch Unitarian theologian; b. about 1540; d. at Clausenburg (220 m. e.s.e of Budapest) 1596. He became rector of the college at Antwerp in 1576, but because of his Socinian teaching was compelled by William of Orange to resign and go into exile. He became rector of the college at Emden, and in 1579 he went to Frankfort, where there seemed prospects of larger religious liberty. But his *Clara demonstratio Antichristum immediate post mortem apostolorum coepissi regnare in ecclesia Christi* (n.p., 1584) caused him new trouble, and he emigrated to Cracow in Poland. A disputation with Faustus Socinus Nov. 29–30, 1584, led to Janssens' *De unigeniti filii Dei existentia* (Cracow, 1595). A little later Janssens withdrew his opposition to the Unitarian doctrine, being offered the pastorate of the Unitarian church at Clausenburg, in the service of which he closed his life.

His system of theology is stated in his *Antithesis doctrinæ Christi et Antichristi de uno vero Deo* (n.p., 1583; reprinted with refutation by J. Zanchius, Neustadt, 1586). He was author also of *Scriptum quo causas propter quas vita æterna contingat complectitur* (1589), and furnished the part on the prophets in the Latin Bible of Tremellius and Junius (Frankfort, 1579).

Bibliography: C . Sandius, *Bibliotheca antitrinitariorum*, passim, Freistadt, 1684; J. N. Paquot, *Mémoires pour servir à l'hist. littéraire de . . . Pays-Bas*, vii. 328–333, 18 vols., Louvain, 1763–70; J. C. A. Hoefer, *Nouvelle biographie générale*, xxvi. 357, Paris, 1861.

JANUARIUS, SAINT: The patron saint of Naples; b., according to tradition, either at Naples or Benevento about the middle of the third century; martyred at Puteoli Sept. 19 (according to other accounts, May 1 or 2, Oct. 19, or Dec. 16), 305. Within a century after his death his relics are said to have been translated to a church before the gates of Naples, whence they were taken, about 820, to Benevento (the head being left in Naples), and were finally interred in a church of Benevento in 1129. Since 1497 they have rested in the Januarius chapel of the cathedral of Naples, the head and two glass flasks said to contain his blood being in the Capelladi Tesoro of the same structure. The famous miracle of the liquefaction of the blood in the flasks when brought near the head is said to have taken place first in the twelfth century, and is abundantly confirmed since the middle of the fifteenth century, as by Pius II. (Aeneas Sylvius), the physician Angelus Cato (1474), the Bollandists Henschen and Papebroch (Mar. 10, 1661), and the Bollandist Stilting (Aug. 21, 1754); cf. the account of J. P. Peters, in *American Church Magazine*, Aug. or Sept., 1902. It occurs three times a year—on the first Saturday of May, in the evening, on Sept. 19 and Dec. 16, between 9 and 10 A.M. "According as the liquefaction is rapid or slow it is considered a good or evil omen for the ensuing year." (Baedeker.) Other miracles are also related as occurring in the nineteenth century in connection with this phenomenon. There are other less important saints and beatified of the same name.

Bibliography: The early *Acta* and *Translatio*, with comment, are in *ASB*, Sept., vi. 762–894. A list of literature is given, Potthast, *Wegweiser*, p. 1385. Consult: Kirwan's *Romanism at Home*, pp. 81–94, New York, 1852; J. Peter, *La Légende de S. Janvier*, Lausanne, 1884; E. Gothein, *Die Culturentwicklung Süd-Italiens*, pp. 112–142, Breslau, 1886.

JAPAN.

I. The Country and People.
II. Native Religions.
  1. Shinto.
    Its Character (§ 1).
    Its Obscuration by Buddhism (§ 2).
    Its Revival (§ 3).
    Its Writings and Cosmogony (§ 4).
    Its Worship and Sects (§ 5).
  2. Buddhism.
    Its Establishment in Japan (§ 1).
    Its Dominance, Decline, and Recovery (§ 2).
    Buddhist Sects (§ 3).
    Modern Doctrinal Basis (§ 4).
III. Christianity in Japan.
  1. Roman Catholic Missions.
    Introduction under St. Francis Xavier (§ 1).
    Conditions Favoring Christianity (§ 2).
    Beginnings of Persecution (§ 3).
    Dissensions among Roman Catholics (§ 4).
    Persecution under Ieyasu (§ 5).
    Period of Exclusion of Christianity (§ 6).
    Renewed Missionary Efforts (§ 7).
    Modern Roman Catholic Missions (§ 8).
    Results (§ 9).
  2. Missions of the Eastern Church.
    Initiation by Nicolai Kasatkin (§ 1).
    Results (§ 2).
  3. Protestant Missions.
    Beginnings in 1859 (§ 1).
    Alternating Advance and Reaction (§ 2).
    The Advance, 1873–88 (§ 3).
    The Obstacles Encountered (§ 4).
    The Reaction of 1889 (§ 5).
    The New Advance since 1899 (§ 6).
    Harmony of Protestant Effort (§ 7).
    General Results (§ 8).

I. The Country and People: [Japan, called by its own people Nihon or Nippon, consists of a chain of nearly 4,000 islands, of which about 500 are inhabited, in the western Pacific, reaching from Formosa to the Kurile Isles, or from 22° to 51° north latitude, a distance of about 2,400 miles, and lying generally in direction n.e. to s.w. off the eastern coast of Asia. Its climate, consequently, ranges from the subtropical to the subarctic. Its central portion is the most important, consisting of the four great islands (named from north to south), Yezo, Honshin, Shikoku, and Kiushiu. Its territory, including Formosa, has an area of 162,154 square miles with a deeply indented coast line nearly 20,000 miles in length, favorably conditioned therefore for commerce by water. It is a country of high mountain ranges, deep valleys, few plains, no great rivers, many volcanoes, and frequent earthquakes, few of which are severe. Its population, slightly under 50,000,000, is of varied stock, the result of the fusion of several migrations possibly of Mongol stock with the original inhabitants. The Ainu, found only in the northern parts, seem to represent the aborigines. The Formosans betray a strong Malay infusion. The principal industries are agriculture and the fisheries, though the development of mining and manufactures during the last quarter century has been enormous. Its government, since 1889, is a constitutional monarchy, with two houses of parliament, the lower entirely elective by the people, the upper partly elective and partly appointive.]

1. Its Character.

II. Native Religions.—1. Shinto: This indigenous cult of Japan combines nature worship, hero worship, and reverence for ancestors. At times its most distinguishing characteristic has been reverence for the imperial family, and the present tendency is to emphasize this feature; nevertheless through long periods of Japanese history the emperors were almost forgotten by the mass of the people, and the extreme honor shown at the present day is largely a growth of the last forty years. The name *Shintō* is the Chinese equivalent of the Japanese *Kami no michi*, "Way of the Superior Beings," the word *kami* (Chinese *shin*), although employed by Christians as the name for God, being used of supernatural beings—whether good or evil—of the spirits of departed heroes, and even of extraordinary natural objects. The number of these beings is said to be 800 myriads. The beginnings of the system are lost in antiquity; but its oldest elements are found in the worship of the forces of nature. Phallicism was once common, but in recent times the government has caused most of the symbols to be removed from public view. Shinto combines religious and non-religious elements, the former being sometimes so overshadowed by the latter as to be hardly discernible. In its present form it has no system of dogmas, no prescribed code of morals, and no sacred writings unless a few semi-historical books and some forms of addresses to the *kami* can be considered such.

2. Its Obscuration by Buddhism.

Buddhism came to Japan in 552 A.D., and in the ninth century it taught that the *kami* were *avatars* (reincarnations) of Buddhist saints. Buddhism proved the stronger religious element in this combination, and most of the prominent Shinto shrines, with the exception of those at Ise and Izumo, were served by Buddhist priests, who introduced the images, incense, and elaborate ritual of their worship. Many of the smaller shrines remained unchanged, and there was nothing in either Shinto or Buddhism that made it seem inconsistent for the people to observe the rites of both. While every locality had its Shinto shrine where some hero or other superior being was honored as the patron saint of the community, it may be said that the people were at the same time Buddhists and Shintoists. There was, however, one marked distinction in their conceptions of the two systems. The chief concern of Shinto was with the present world, while Buddhism busied itself more with what came after death. The erection of buildings and the commencement of public works were preceded by Shinto rites, and infants were taken to the village shrine for consecration to the local deity; but funerals and memorial services for the dead were conducted by Buddhist priests. Hence graveyards were contiguous to Buddhist temples, while Shintoism avoided the pollution associated with death. In the rare cases where Shinto funerals were held, there were usually additional Buddhist rites.

3. Its Revival.

In the seventeenth century a movement began for the revival of ancient Shinto, largely political in its motives. It was chiefly conducted by scholars who investigated old records and embodied the results in books that advocated a return to ancient ideas of government and ritual. Their writings, though reaching only a small section of people, had an important influence in bringing about the overthrow of the shogunate in 1868 and the restoration of imperial power. In connection with that great change the ancient department of Shinto rites was reestablished. Buddhist ornaments and ritual were banished from the ancient shrines, a grant equal to about $300,000 a year was made for their maintenance, and preachers were sent out to instruct the people in the ancient beliefs. This movement was shortlived. The department of Shinto rites was degraded until it became a subbureau of the home department, the Buddhists recovered many shrines, and in most respects people returned to their former ways. In 1899 the officials of the most honored Shinto shrine, that of Dai Jingu in Ise, obtained the government's consent to their request that they no longer be considered as forming a religious body, but as an association for performing rites in honor of the imperial ancestors and for conducting patriotic ceremonies. The tendency of recent years has been to consider Shinto itself a system for fostering patriotism and loyalty. This makes it possible, without violation of the freedom of conscience guaranteed by the national constitution, to claim that every Japanese ought to support it and take part in its ceremonies. While, however, the shrines are not considered religious buildings, there are frequently connected with them voluntary associations of a religious character called *kyōkwai*, the name used by Christians to designate a church.

4. Its Writings and Cosmogony.

The chief authority for the cosmogony and mythology of Shinto is the *Kojiki* (" Records of Ancient Matters "), a compilation of legends that was completed in 712 A.D. The *Nihongi* (" Chronicles of Japan "), though compiled only eight years later, is much more affected by Chinese ideas. The *Yengishiki* describes the ritual as practised in the Yengi era (901–923) and includes prayers that had come down from more ancient times. According to the *Kojiki*, after heaven and earth were separated from the original chaos, three *kami* came into existence on the Heavenly Plain and afterward passed away. They were succeeded by others until finally there came two named *Izanagi* (" Male who Invites ") and *Izanami* (" Female who Invites "). Standing on the bridge of Heaven, these two thrust a spear into the liquid mass below them, and as they drew it back, the falling drops became an island, to which they descended. They there gave birth to the other islands of Japan and afterward to a number of gods and goddesses. The birth of the Fire-god caused the death of *Izanami*. *Izanagi* visited her in the underworld, but did not succeed in bringing her back to earth. After his return, as he purified himself from the pollution he had incurred, new deities were produced from each article of clothing and from different parts of his body. The most important of these was Amaterasu-O-Mi-Kami, the Sun-goddess, who, after a quarrel with one of her brothers, withdrew into a cave, leaving the earth in darkness. The 800 myriad deities lured her forth by offerings, dances, songs, and the exhibition of a mirror in which she seemed to see another being as splendid as herself. One of her descendants was Jimmu Tennō, the first emperor of Japan, whose ascension to the throne is said to have occurred 660 B.C.

5. Its Worship and Sects.

A Shinto shrine in its purest form is of very simple architecture, being constructed of unpainted wood and thatched with bark or thin shingles. Before it is a *torii* or detached portal. There is no visible object of worship, but hidden within the sanctuary is something in which the spirit of the *kami* is supposed to reside. At the shrine in Ise there is a mirror said to have been bestowed by the Sun-goddess on her grandson when she sent him to subdue the land. Shrines where mirrors are exposed to view and those with tiled roofs or painted wood show the influence of Buddhism. Services consist chiefly of the recital of ancient prayers, the offering of articles of food, and dancing by priestesses. Ise and other prominent shrines are visited by large numbers of pilgrims, who carry home charms to be placed in their household shrines. Shinto lays stress on ceremonial purity. There is no formulated system of ethics, such being thought necessary only for the immoral people of other lands, while in Japan each person's heart teaches him what he ought to do. A number of popular sects have more of the religious element than has the Shintoism thus far described. The Kurozumi, Tenrikyō, and Remmonkyō sects are the best known. Springing up in the last century, they combine Shinto, Buddhist, and Confucian elements. Most of these sects make much of curing disease through faith or by incantations, and at times have gained large numbers of adherents.

1. Its Establishment in Japan.

2. Buddhism: Buddhism was introduced into Japan in 552 A.D. when the king of Kudara, a Korean state, sent to the mikado a golden image, some sutras, and other religious objects. A temple was built and put under the care of the prime minister. An epidemic that soon after broke out was attributed to the anger of the gods at the introduction of the foreign religion, and the temple was overthrown; but it is averred that all attempts to destroy the image proved vain, so that it is in existence at the present day, there being, however, two temples, each of which claims to possess it. Priests and nuns, with images and books, were soon after sent from Korea. Though Buddhism found much favor at court, there was a strong party that opposed the supplanting of Shinto by the foreign system, but an appeal to arms resulted in the defeat of the Shintoists. The new religion made a great gain when a Korean priest claimed to recognize in the mikado's infant son the reincarnation of a famous priest of China and obtained permission to superintend the boy's education. The prince, best known by his posthumous name, Shōtoku Taishi (572–621), afterward became regent and was an earnest defender of Buddhism. An imperial edict in 621 made it the established religion of the country. There were at that time forty-six temples with 1,385 priests and nuns. Many of these had come from Korea and China, countries which had contributed to Japan their literature, arts, and sciences through the teachers of Buddhism. Appreciation of the new civilization made progressive people more ready to listen to the religious doctrines of its representatives.

2. Its Dominance, Decline, and Recovery.

Acceptance of the doctrine that the ruler of a nation gained great merit by abdicating and becoming a monk vastly increased the influence of the monasteries, which thus became allied with the imperial family. The new faith spread from the upper to the lower classes. Its progress was more easy because it did not demand the abandonment of old beliefs and forms of worship. As in other countries, Buddhism could accommodate itself to the religious ideas of those whom it desired to win. At the beginning of the ninth century the priest Kūkai (better known by his posthumous title, Kōbō Daishi) formulated the doctrine that the Shinto deities were *avatars* of Buddhist saints, while the classification of many deified heroes as *gongen*, temporary manifestations of Buddha, simplified the problem and provided for the apotheosis of future emperors and great men. Most of the Shinto shrines soon lost their former simplicity, images and decorations of various kinds being introduced into them, while the forms of worship combined Shinto and Buddhist elements in proportions that differed with time and locality. Buddhism became the chief religious force in Japan and gradually attained to great political influence and even military power. In the Middle Ages some of the monasteries were strong fortresses, the monks of which took an active part in war with rival sects or political enemies. In the last half of the sixteenth century these fortresses were destroyed by the military leaders, Nobunaga and Hideyoshi, while the power of Buddhism was further weakened by the success of the Roman Catholic missions. Under the Tokugawa shoguns (1603–1867) it was restored to favor. The advent of Christian missions has done much to arouse the Buddhist priests from the lethargy into which they had fallen. Some of the sects imitate Christian methods, establishing schools for boys and girls, young men's associations, women's societies, and charitable institutions, while many Buddhist journals are published. Preachers have been sent to Korea, China, Hawaii, and California, primarily for the sake of Japanese colonists, but also with the hope of gaining converts.

3. Buddhist Sects.

Japanese Buddhism is divided into many sects. Some of these were brought from China, while others originated in Japan itself. Those now in existence, with the dates of their establishment, are as follows: Tendai (three subsects), 805; Shingon (two subsects), 806; Yuzu Nembutsu, 1127; Jodo (three subsects), 1174; Rinzai (nine subsects), 1168; Shin, also called Monto or Ikko (ten subsects), 1224; Soto, 1227; Nichiren or Hokke (seven subsects), 1253; Ji, 1276; Obaku, 1650. The Rinzai, Soto, and Obaku sects are offshoots from the old Zen sect, by whose name they are sometimes called. The word *zen* signifies " contemplation," the earnest followers of this system giving much time to meditation, or rather to an attempt to induce a sort of hypnotic condition in which there is a complete absence of thought. The Zen sects together with the Tendai and Shingon are sometimes called the learned sects, as they have attached much importance to the study of the Sanscrit texts. The sects having the most influence with the people at the present time are the Jodo, Shin, and Nichiren. The name of the first signifies " Pure Land." It teaches that Amida (Amitabha), the object of its worship, made a series of vows to the effect that on attaining the state of a Buddha he would create a paradise into which those who had faith in him should enter after death. This faith is chiefly shown by use of the formula *Namu Amida Butsu* (" Hail, Amida Buddha! "). The Shin sect sprang from the Jodo, which it rebukes for seeking salvation through " self-effort depending on the merits of another," while it teaches reliance upon Amida's merit alone. This belief in salvation by faith, the rejection of penance, fasting, and other forms of asceticism, together with the fact that it permits its priests to marry, has caused the Shin sect to be called the Protestantism of Japanese Buddhism. The Nichiren sect highly esteems charms, amulets, and pilgrimages. Its temples are gorgeous and the services noisy, and its priests are considered expert in exorcising demons. Delighting in controversy, the priests attack the doctrines of other sects, while these declare that the Nichiren sect ought not to be considered as belonging to Buddhism. The Yuzu Nembutsu and the Ji sects have but a small following.

4. Modern Doctrinal Basis.

Though three extinct sects belonged to the *Hinayana* (" Smaller Vehicle "), Japanese Buddhism of to-day belongs to the Mahayana (" Greater Vehicle "). The differences that divide the sects turn upon abstruse metaphysical and technical points, and often depend upon the sutras that are held in chief honor, here being one point in which the divisions of Buddhism differ from those of Christianity with its one Bible. It is to be remembered further that, as very few of these books have been translated into Japanese, they are read only by the priests. The common people have but slight knowledge of Buddhist doctrines. Simply following the religious customs that have been handed down in their families for generations, they know little about the meaning of the rites or the nature of the beings that they worship. The beliefs of the younger priests are being greatly influenced by Western ideas. One resulting movement has taken the name " New Buddhism." It is an attempt to bring Buddhist doctrines, or rather nomenclature, into harmony with modern thought. The doctrines are so explained as to bear little resemblance to what was formerly taught; and there is an attempt to replace the pessimism of Buddhism by a more hopeful philosophy. No formulated system has yet been constructed, as the leaders differ greatly among themselves; some being atheistic, some pantheistic, while others assert that they believe in a personal God.

III. Christianity in Japan.—1. Roman Catholic Missions: The Portuguese, who had previously visited the Liukiu Islands, reached Japan proper about 1542. Six years later one of their ships brought a young Japanese named Yajiro (the Paul Anjiro of the Jesuit accounts) to Malacca, where he met St.

1. Introduction Under St. Francis Xavier.

Francis Xavier. He was sent to the Jesuit college in Goa, and there, with his servant and another Japanese, was soon afterward baptized. In response to Yajiro's entreaties that missionaries be sent to his people, Xavier, with Fathers Cosmo and Torres and Brother Juan Fernandez, accompanied the three Japanese back to their own land, reaching Kagoshima Aug. 15, 1549. There they met a favorable reception, the daimio (feudal lord) of that region authorizing them to teach their religion and permitting his subjects to become Christians. With Yajiro's help Xavier prepared a summary of Christian doctrine in Japanese, which he wrote out in Roman letters, and since he never learned much of the language of the country, his direct evangelistic work while in Japan consisted chiefly in reading this book upon the streets to those who were drawn by curiosity to see and hear the foreigner. About 100 persons had been baptized in Kagoshima when the Buddhist priests stirred up the daimio to order that no more of his people should become Christians under penalty of death. After having been in Kagoshima a little more than a year, the missionaries went to Hirado, where Xavier says that "in a few days about 100 persons became Christians." He and Fernandez then pushed on to Kyoto, the capital, where it was their hope to convert the rulers of the land. That city was so convulsed by civil strife that it was impossible to obtain a hearing. They therefore returned to Yamaguchi, where they had spent a few days on their way to Kyoto, and where ere long a number of converts were secured.

2. Conditions favoring Christianity.

In all, Xavier spent only twenty-seven months in Japan before returning to India. Though he led the way and inspired others, the real work was done by Torres and Fernandez, who spent the remainder of their lives in Japan, and by those who afterward joined the mission. Many circumstances favored their success. The Japanese were to a remarkable degree ready to listen to new doctrines. Shintoism had little religious influence; Buddhism was powerful, but its leaders were taking an active part in political and military affairs, and for this reason many of the daimios were ready to favor a movement that seemed likely to weaken the power of the arrogant priesthood. Some of the feudal lords were also desirous of attracting foreign commerce. The country had long been vexed by internal strife; and Nobunaga, the military leader who, by gaining control of the central provinces, began the work that finally resulted in the unification of the country, was a bitter enemy of the Buddhists and openly favored the missionaries. Among the early converts were several feudal lords and other men of high rank. Some of these confiscated the Buddhist temples, destroyed the images, and compelled their subjects to be baptized. Christianity soon gained a strong foothold in Kiushiu and in the region of Kyoto. Churches, monasteries, and schools were built, and many books of instruction or devotion were published. In 1583 the Christian lords of Kiushiu sent four young men on an embassy to the pope. In 1581 the Christians numbered about 150,000, and probably the highest number ever attained was 300,000 in 1596.

3. Beginnings of Persecution.

Hideyoshi, who, soon after Nobunaga's death (1582), gained control of political affairs, seemed at first inclined to favor the Christians, some of whom were among his leading officers. In 1587, however, he suddenly sent into exile Takayama Ukon (the Justo Ucondono of the Jesuit historians), the most prominent of the Christians, and ordered all the missionaries to leave the country within twenty days. The chief reasons given by Roman Catholic historians for this action are the scandalous lives of the Portuguese merchants, that Hideyoshi was angered at Christian maidens who would not yield to his lust and that the refusal of a Portuguese captain to bring into harbor a large ship that he wished to examine aroused suspicions. Japanese accounts say that from the first he had considered Christianity dangerous to the state and had only been waiting a favorable opportunity for attacking it, and also that the arrogant demeanor of the missionaries enraged him. Murdoch suggests that Hideyoshi probably had no desire to extirpate Christianity, but only to reduce it to the position of a serviceable tool. However this may be, he postponed the time of the missionaries' departure for six months, and even then did not insist upon the enforcement of the decrees, though he pretended to be angry at the failure to carry them into effect. The missionaries worked in a less public manner than formerly, but there continued to be many baptisms.

4. Dissensions Among Roman Catholics.

Papal bulls by Gregory XIII., Jan. 28, 1585, confirmed by Clement III., 1600, had decreed that none but Jesuits should go as missionaries to Japan; and Philip II., ruler of Spain and Portugal, had given the merchants of the latter country a monopoly of trade with Japan. The Spanish colonists in the Philippines and the different religious orders that had established themselves there were very restive under these restrictions, and finally broke them. Franciscan monks, coming as envoys from the governor of the Philippines, were allowed by Hideyoshi to reside in Kyoto on condition that they would not attempt to teach their religion. Soon, however, they were engaged in the open propagation of Christianity. Bitter feeling arose between the two orders, and also between the Portuguese and Spanish merchants who allied themselves respectively with the Jesuits and the Franciscans. In 1595 the pilot of a Spanish ship wrecked on the coast of Japan was pointing out on a map the wide possessions of his king. When asked how so many lands in different parts of the earth had been brought under one sway, he replied: "The king first sends out teachers of religion. After they have gained the hearts of a sufficient number of persons, soldiers are sent to unite with these converts in subduing the desired territory." This speech was reported to Hideyoshi, who had always suspected that the missionaries had political ends in view. Thinking it time to give them another warning, he ordered arrests to be made, and six

Franciscan missionaries and twenty Japanese Christians were taken to Nagasaki and crucified. A new edict forbade any of the daimios to become Christians, and ordered all missionaries to leave the country. By dressing Portuguese merchants in clerical robes and sending them on board a ship, the Jesuits pretended to be obeying the command, and thus, with a few exceptions, they were able to remain concealed in Japan.

5. Persecution Under Ieyasu.

Hideyoshi died in 1598. The missionaries came out from their hiding-places and were reenforced by new arrivals. Unfortunately their work was weakened by dissensions between the orders. Augustinians and Dominicans, as well as Franciscans, disregarded the papal prohibitions and came to Japan from the Philippines. After a period of civil strife, Ieyasu, the founder of the Tokugawa line of shoguns, gained control of the country. His desire for commerce led him to adopt a kindly policy toward the missionaries; but some of the Christians were active supporters of his enemies, and they were also accused of plots with foreign rulers to effect his overthrow. Indeed, in all this history of Roman Catholicism in Japan, the chief cause of official opposition was the suspicion that its teachers were agents of the European nations that wished to gain possession of Japan. In 1614 Ieyasu ordered the expulsion of the missionaries and the suppression of Christianity, and the flames of persecution broke out. Not only missionaries, but many Japanese Christians were deported, and horrible tortures were invented to secure recantation. Although multitudes apostatized, there were many that stood firm. Men, women, and even little children were beheaded, burned at the stake, or crucified. Many missionaries also suffered, for they had endeavored to remain in the country, and even those who had been once expelled returned under various disguises to face almost certain martyrdom. After Ieyasu's death (1616) the persecution was continued by his son, Hidetada. The final blow came in the suppression (1638) of a rebellion raised by the peasants living in Shimabara and Amakusa. Though largely a revolt against the oppression of their daimios, the leaders were Christians, and they fought under banners inscribed with the names of Jesus, of Mary, and also of St. James, the patron saint of Spain. The rebels seized an old castle, where they defended themselves so bravely that they were put down only with the greatest difficulty. When finally defeated, all of them were put to death. The laws against Christianity were thereafter enforced still more strictly, and the country was closed to all foreigners except the Dutch, who were permitted under restrictions to have a trading-post in Nagasaki.

6. Period of Exclusion of Christianity.

For more than two centuries Japan refused to have intercourse with foreign nations. The Christians were deprived of all the sacraments except baptism. In every town was posted a notice saying "The evil sect called Christian is strictly prohibited," and offering rewards for information against believers. Every householder was required to procure annually from the Buddhist priests a certificate that no member of his family was a Christian. In many parts of the land all were compelled to trample on a cross or on a copper plate that bore a representation of the crucified Jesus. The publication of books containing references to Christianity was prohibited. The Dutch ships that came to Nagasaki were closely searched for priests and Christian books. Nevertheless Christianity was not completely extirpated, but was carefully handed down from parent to child. Sacred images were hidden in what had the appearance of Buddhist shrines, lay baptism was practised, in some villages nearly all the inhabitants were believers, and had their catechists and baptizers. Ways were devised for evading the tests used for the detection of believers. In some places where the officials were themselves Christians the plate on which the people trampled was engraved with Buddhist symbols. Elsewhere the believers, after stepping upon the cross, would wash their feet and drink the water while returning thanks that they had been permitted to touch the sacred symbol. But from time to time Christians were discovered by the officials and punished.

7. Renewed Missionary Efforts.

The missionaries made some attempts to return. In 1642 five Jesuits entered the country and were put to death; they were followed a year later by five others, who were imprisoned until their death; as was also the case with Sidotti, an Italian priest who, in 1709, had himself set ashore on the coast of Japan. In 1844 a French war vessel left under the name of official interpreters a missionary and a Chinese evangelist in Liuchiu, which was a dependency of Japan. It was thought that they might there learn the Japanese language, do missionary work among the people, and be preparing for the opening of the Japanese group itself. They and others who succeeded them were so closely watched that they were able to have but little intercourse with the inhabitants. Protestants were also seeking entrance to Japan. In 1837 the ship *Morrison* attempted to restore some shipwrecked Japanese to their country. In addition to this philanthropic motive, there was a hope that the expedition might help to open the land to trade and the Gospel. Three missionaries from China accompanied it. The waifs were not allowed to land, and the *Morrison* was fired upon, so that it had to return without having accomplished anything. A number of British officers organized the Loochoo Naval Mission, and in 1845 sent Dr. Bettelheim, a medical missionary, to the Liuchiu Islands. Though subjected to the most annoying surveillance and opposition, he baptized a few persons. He also prepared Japanese translations of portions of the Scriptures, and some of these were printed.

8. Modern Roman Catholic Missions.

In 1854 Commodore Perry succeeded in negotiating a treaty between the United States and Japan. This did not provide for the residence of Americans; but later treaties made with the United States and some other nations permitted their citizens after July, 1859, to live in certain ports. The Société des Missions Étrangères at once commenced work in Yokohama, Hakodate, and

Nagasaki. At first the missionaries could do little except study the language and open schools, where they taught those desiring to learn French. In 1862 a church, nominally erected for the use of foreigners, was dedicated in Yokohama, and the missionaries soon found themselves engaged in addressing the crowds that gathered about them, and several of their auditors were arrested. The French minister secured the release of these persons by promising that there should be no more preaching in the Japanese language. In 1865 a church building was dedicated in Nagasaki. One morning, as M. Petitjean, the missionary in charge, was kneeling before the altar, three women drew near and kneeling near him, said in a low voice, "Our heart is one with yours," and then told him that all the people in the village from which they came were Christians. The descendants of the ancient Christians, for whom the missionaries had from the first been seeking, were found. The discovery of other Christian communities followed, and ultimately the missionaries learned of about 50,000 persons, most of them living near Nagasaki, who considered themselves Christians, though for various reasons about half of these refrained from entering into close relations with the missionaries. The missionaries became busily occupied in instructing and caring for these believers. Though they tried to exercise due caution, it was not long before arrests began to be made. After the new government was thoroughly established in 1868, the persecution became severe, and from one cluster of villages 3,000 persons were exiled to distant provinces. The official representatives of Western nations united in a protest, declaring that by persecuting Christians Japan was showing dishonor to the countries whose people believed in the same religion. The Japanese government at first refused to yield and told the foreign ministers that "it would resist the propagation of Christianity as it would oppose the advance of an invading army." In 1873, however, orders were issued for removing from public view the edicts against Christianity. Though the laws had not been repealed, it was evident that they would not be enforced. From that time Roman Catholics shared with others the constantly increasing degree of religious freedom which at last found expression in the following article of the constitution promulgated in 1890: "Japanese subjects shall, within limits not prejudicial to peace and order, and not antagonistic to their duties as subjects, enjoy freedom of religious belief."

9. Results.

In comparing the growth of Roman Catholicism with that of Protestantism and of the Greek Church, it must be remembered that it began its new propaganda with several thousand adherents, while the others had none. On the other hand, it has been more hindered than they by the prejudices aroused three centuries ago against Christianity. Its work has spread into most of the large towns of Japan. It is governed by an archbishop who, with his coadjutor, lives in Tokyo; and there are four bishops, whose residences are in Tokyo, Sendai, Osaka, and Nagasaki. At the close of 1907 the missionaries, most of whom are French, numbered 124 men and 124 women. There were 33 Japanese priests and 303 catechists. The number of believers was 61,095, of whom more than half were in the island of Kiushiu. 1,551 adults and 3,604 infants were baptized in 1907. Schools for the training of priests had 20 students. There were several other schools, while in 19 orphanages 1,027 children found a home. Among other forms of charity, two hospitals for lepers deserve special notice. A large number of books is published, among them being a translation of the Bible. There are also two periodicals issued by the mission.

1. Initiation by Nicolai Kasatkin.

2. Missions of the Eastern Church: In 1861 Nicolai Kasatkin went to Hakodate as chaplain of the Russian consulate there. As a student he had been moved by a desire to give the Gospel to the Japanese, and this position furnished an opening for carrying out his wish. His first convert was a Shinto priest whose prejudice against Christianity led him to come to the chaplain either to conquer him in argument, or to assassinate him, who, however, became convinced that the foreigner's doctrine was true, and in 1868 he and two others were secretly baptized. When the Shogunate was overthrown, many of those who belonged to the defeated party went to Hakodate, among them several from the Sendai clan. Led in part by curiosity and in part by the thought that a new religion might subserve their political aims, some of them began to study Christianity. Many accepted it and returned as evangelists to their own province, or went elsewhere to teach what they had learned. In a visit to Russia, Nicolai organized a missionary society to support his efforts, and when in 1871 another priest took his place in Hakodate, he removed to Tokyo, where, besides engaging in direct evangelistic work, he opened a seminary for training evangelists and also a school for teaching languages and the sciences. In 1872 three evangelists in Sendai were arrested with several of their hearers, and there were arrests in Hakodate. Appeals to the imperial government resulted in the release of these persons. That same year Nicolai baptized ten persons in Tokyo; the greatest secrecy was observed, but a few days later a Buddhist priest showed him a sketch, drawn by a spy of the government, of the room in which the ceremony had taken place. But, as no arrests followed, anxiety gave way to confidence. Other spies entered the school as pupils and at least two became Christians. Great success attended the early efforts at evangelization, especially in Sendai and its vicinity. In 1875 the man mentioned above as the first convert was ordained as the first priest.

2. Results.

Nicolai was made a bishop in 1880. The growth of the Eastern Church in Japan has been to a remarkable degree due to this one man. There have never been more than four other missionaries, and most of the time only one. He trained the Japanese priests and, in addition to the supervision of churches and schools, he prepared a translation of the New Testament and published several other books. A force of ten translators and writers is kept busy under his direction. The connection of this mission with Russia, and the relations of Church and government in that land have made it the object of much suspicion. The large cathedral in Tokyo occupies one of the most conspicuous sites in the city, and stands on ground leased in the name of the Russian legation, facts which have caused considerable ill-feeling, and even given rise to threats of destruction. Bishop Nicolai has, however, gained the respect of all; when war broke out in 1904 between Japan and Russia, he left it to his followers to decide whether he should remain in Japan or return to his own land. They urged him to stay with them, and this he did, to the general approval of the public. The statistics for 1907 show 265 churches, 30,166 members, 37 ordained Japanese priests, and 129 other evangelists. The contributions of the churches for the year amounted to 10,711 *yen* ($5,355.50). Workers for the Church are trained in a theological seminary and an evangelists' school. The former gives a liberal education and teaches theology in the Russian language; the latter is of a lower grade, and uses only the Japanese language. There are two boarding-schools for girls and several day schools, while three periodicals are published. In 1907 Nicolai was made an archbishop, another Russian being sent out as bishop.

1. Beginnings in 1859.

3. Protestant Missions: The treaty made by Japan with the United States in 1858 provided that in July of the next year certain ports should be opened for the residence of American citizens; also that "Americans in Japan shall be allowed the free exercise of their religion, and for this purpose shall have the right to erect suitable places of worship. No injury shall be done to such buildings, nor any insult offered to the religious worship of the Americans." This treaty was followed by similar ones with other Western nations. Though no permission was given for teaching Christianity to the Japanese, it was believed that this would soon become possible. Soon after the treaty was signed, Chaplain Wood, U. S. N., Dr. S. Wells Williams, the well-known missionary and diplomatist, and Rev. E. W. Syle met in Nagasaki. As a result of their conference, they decided to write to the Episcopal, Reformed (Dutch), and Presbyterian Boards in America urging that they send missionaries to Japan. Within a year all three societies had done this. In May, 1859, two months before the time set for opening the ports, the Rev. J. Liggins, of the Episcopal Board, was in Nagasaki, where he was followed a month later by the Rev. (afterward Bishop) C. M. Williams. In October, J. C. Hepburn (q.v.), of the Presbyterian Board, reached Kanagawa, while the next month saw the arrival of three missionaries of the Reformed Board—Rev. S. R. Brown and D. B. Simmons, M.D., at Kanagawa, and Rev. G. F. Verbeck (q.v.) at Nagasaki. The next April, Rev. J. Goble, who had been a marine on Perry's expedition, came to Kanagawa under the American Baptist Free Mission. At first the missionaries labored under great difficulties. They were surrounded by spies and were in danger of attack from those who hated all things foreign, and especially the Christian religion. One man became Dr. Hepburn's teacher with the intention of assassinating him. Japanese who showed any inclination toward Christianity were in danger of arrest. The teaching of English gave some opportunities for exerting an influence over young men. Even before missionaries came, Chaplain Wood, U. S. N., had held classes, and though extreme caution was necessary, the questions asked by students about words found in their books could be answered only by telling something concerning Christian beliefs. In 1861 the Shogun's court itself sent several persons to the missionaries for instruction in English. As many of those who were gathered in such classes afterward held places of influence, the honor in which they held their teachers and the ideas that they received concerning morals, politics, education, and religion had much influence in shaping the course of events in which these men became leaders. It was a great help to the propagation of the Gospel that educated Japanese could read Chinese. Their curiosity to learn about Western ideas led them to purchase not only works on geography, history, and science prepared by missionaries in China, but also those dealing directly with Christian truth, and even the Bible itself.

2. Alternating Advance and Reaction.

In Jan., 1866, a meeting held by Christian believers of various nationalities living in Yokohama issued an address to the Christian world asking that special prayers be offered for Japan. It mentioned among encouraging changes that the missionaries were no longer watched by spies, but were in some instances employed by the goverment as school-teachers, that students of English no longer uttered the name of Jesus with bated breath, but manifested a readiness to talk about Christianity; and that some of them went daily to the missionaries "to read the English Bible, preferring this to the study of school-books." At Yokohama in 1864 occurred the first Protestant baptism in Japan. In 1866 at Nagasaki a high official from Saga was baptized with his brother. The greatest secrecy had to be observed, as the new converts were liable to capital punishment. Up to the spring of 1872 only ten persons had been baptized. Soon after the restoration of imperial power in 1868, the attempt to revive the Shinto religion was accompanied by a renewal of strong opposition to Christianity. The new government posted edicts against it almost identical with those of the Shogunate. One of the few baptized Protestants was cast into prison. In 1870 and 1871 two teachers of missionaries were arrested under suspicion of being Christians, and one of them died in prison. Knowledge of these persecutions made other persons afraid for a while to visit the missionaries. Yet even before the removal of the edicts in 1873, it became evident that the government was becoming more liberal, and in Mar., 1872, the first Japanese church was organized in Yokohama with eleven members as a result of the work of the Reformed and the Presbyterian missionaries. Though this church has since become connected with the Nihon Kirisuto Kyokwai (Presbyterian), it at first had no denominational name. The next two churches, those of Kobé and Osaka, organized in 1874 in connection with the mission of the American Board, were of a similar nature, and it was the hope of most of the missionaries then in Japan that this policy could be continued; but that same year new churches in Yokohama and Tokyo were put "on a strictly Presbyterian basis."

3. The Advance, 1873-88.

The year 1873 marked the beginning of a period of rapid advance. Among progressive Japanese there sprang up a great desire to adopt Western customs and ideas. Protestant Christianity, as the religion of England and America, was thought to be at least worthy of investigation, and large audiences listened to its proclamation. Some, like the popular leader Fukuzawa, argued that as a matter of policy it would be well for the country nominally to adopt Christianity. The Christian schools became crowded with earnest young men and women, many of whom became Christians and showed much zeal for carrying the Gospel to others. Bibles and other religious books had an increasing sale. The churches received large accessions to their membership, and several became self-supporting. In 1883 a general convention of the missionaries and a union meeting of the Japanese Christians were followed by marked religious awakenings. So rapid did the growth of the churches become that extravagant expectations were aroused, and even some enemies of Christianity said that ere the century closed it would be the most prominent religion of the land. The statistics of Protestant missions for 1888 showed 249 churches with a membership of 25,514, the number of adults baptized in the year being 6,959. Outside of the professedly missionary ranks there were those from foreign lands who did much to help on the movement. Among them may be mentioned President Clark of the Massachusetts Agricultural College, who, in 1876, went to Japan to assist in establishing a similar institution in Sapporo. Capt. Janes, U. S. A., who was employed as a teacher in the city of Kumamoto, invited his pupils to come to his house for the study of the Bible. Some of them became Christians, whereupon a severe persecution broke out. A number of these went, in 1876, to the Doshisha School which Joseph Neesima and missionaries of the American Board had opened the preceding year in Kyoto. Mr. Neesima was a young man who, at a time when an attempt to leave the country was a capital crime, had been led by his desire to learn about God and Western civilization to go to America (1864). He was there befriended by Alpheus Hardy, a Boston merchant, and given opportunities for study such as fitted him to do a noteworthy religious and educational work for his own people.

4. The Obstacles Encountered.

The period of rapid growth was not without its difficulties. The movements of missionaries were hampered by regulations that limited freedom of travel in the interior. While the imperial government as a whole pursued a liberal policy, the educational department was much of the time in control of those who exerted a strong influence against Christianity. Local officials sometimes put hindrances in the way of evangelization, and there was much petty persecution by the relatives and neighbors of believers. Fear of losing office, trade, or popularity deterred many from following what they believed to be the truth. Buddhism awoke from its slumber to oppose the rival religion by means of lectures, tracts, schools, and societies. When elections were to be held in 1890 for the first national diet, the Buddhists entered the political arena and urged that the people should not choose any Christians to represent them. It was a bitter disappointment when returns showed that out of the 300 members of the House of Commons, thirteen were Christians, one of whom was made president, while another became chairman of the committee of the whole. Incidentally it may be mentioned that in subsequent diets Christians have several times held the same offices or that of vice-president, which is one of many facts that disprove the assertion that the influential classes in Japan are not reached by the Gospel.

5. The Reaction of 1889.

The movement in favor of Christianity was checked by a reaction that began to be apparent about 1889. Failure to secure desired revision of treaties, with other untoward events, caused the Japanese to feel much irritation against foreign nations. Conservatives seized the opportunity to foster a nationalistic spirit; while the relations of Christianity with western lands had once been helpful, now they proved a hindrance. Preaching-places were no longer crowded; pupils left the Christian schools, there were few additions to the churches, and many defections. Hitherto there had been but little doctrinal discussion; this was now aroused by the coming of Unitarian and other liberal missions, as well as by the increased reading of books written in other lands. The fondness of the Japanese for novelty and the desire of many to show their independence of the missionaries who had been their teachers increased the tendency to advocate all sorts of views, while theological unrest led to spiritual decline and a relaxation of evangelistic efforts, and the growth of trade and manufactures fostered a commercial spirit that made it more difficult to interest men in religious themes. Nevertheless, some advance was made in this period, so that in 1900 there were 538 churches with 42,451 members.

6. The New Advance Since 1899.

This reaction gradually spent its force. Revised treaties, becoming effective in 1899, lessened the feeling against foreigners and made it possible for missionaries to travel or reside in any part of the land, while the treaty of alliance with Great Britain (1902) increased the favor with which Christian lands, and consequently their religion, were regarded. Regulations issued by the government regarding buildings used by religious bodies were a practical recognition of Christianity and put it on the same standing as Buddhism. Moreover, the twentieth century opened with the manifestation of renewed earnestness and evangelistic zeal on the part of the Christians. The war with Russia did much to sober the thoughts of the people and incline them to consider other than material interests, and also opened up many opportunities for work in behalf of the soldiers, the military authorities cordially welcoming that carried on by the Young Men's Christian Association in Manchuria, the emperor himself contributing to its support, while in Japan there was much done for the soldiers on their way to the front, for the invalids in the hospitals, and for the families that were in distress. The statistics of Protestant missions show that at the close of 1907 there were 295 male missionaries and 255 unmarried women; the total, including wives, being 789. There were 529 organized churches, of which 102 were wholly self-supporting. The church-members (including probationers and baptized children) numbered 71,818, of whom 57,830 were communicants. The adult baptisms in the year had been 8,623; and the money raised by the churches amounted to 274,608 *yen* ($137,304). There were 469 ordained Japanese ministers, 626 evangelists, and 208 Bible-women.

7. Harmony of Protestant Effort. While many varieties of Protestantism are represented in Japan, there has been a great degree of harmony among the different bodies. Nearly all have joined heartily in united evangelistic efforts, and have manifested a tendency toward the organic union of churches having similar forms of government. The churches connected with the various Presbyterian missions form the Nippon Kirisuto Kyokwai (Church of Christ in Japan); those connected with Episcopal missions of America and England form the Sei Kokwai (Holy Catholic Church); and a similar union of Methodists was effected in 1907. These three bodies and the Kumi-ai Kyokwai (Congregational churches) are of nearly equal strength, their membership including more than five-sixths of the whole. Nearly all the churches except the Sei Kokwai use the same hymn-book; and by arrangement with the latter body 100 of its hymns are uniform with those of the Union Hymnal. Most of the missions are represented in the "Standing Committee of Co-operating Missions," which serves as "a general medium of reference, communication, and effort." The Japanese Christians are also united in an alliance that holds large conventions from time to time. Most of the missions have educational institutions of various grades; a few schools have been established by the Japanese Christians. In many of the government schools of higher grade there are Christian associations. The International Young Men's Christian Association has sent secretaries to several of the larger cities of Japan, and these, in addition to work for the general associations, give counsel and help to those in the schools. The educational officials have also used their aid in securing from America men of good character and ability as teachers of English. In the island of Yezo the Church Missionary Society has a mission to the Ainu, an aboriginal race which is gradually becoming extinct. Of the 16,000 survivors, about 1,200 are Christians. Much successful work has been done among the Japanese emigrants in Hawaii and on the Pacific coast of the United States. Since Formosa came into the possession of Japan, some of the Japanese churches have sent evangelists there to labor for their own people and also for the native inhabitants. Other evangelists have been sent for similar work in Korea (q.v.) and the Chinese ports.

8. General Results. Even before the country was opened to foreign intercourse, most Japanese men were able to read more or less; and since the establishment of the educational system this ability has become almost universal among both men and women. This has made a great opening for Christian literature. The translation of the New Testament was completed in 1879, that of the Old Testament in 1877. For the most part the Scriptures are sold, and not given, to the people, the largest work of gratuitous distribution being in the army. Other Christian books and tracts were at first prepared by the missionaries or under their supervision, but now they come almost entirely from Japanese writers and are to a large extent published by Japanese firms. The same is true of Christian periodicals. Schools for poor children, orphan asylums, hospitals, dispensaries, leper asylums, schools for the blind, reform schools, and homes for released prisoners have been established, and these institutions have been founded and conducted by the Japanese Christians themselves. They have so far gained the approval and confidence of the people that believers and non-believers alike have contributed toward their support, and some of them have received large gifts from the emperor and empress. The Christians are also recognized leaders in reform movements, such as those against intemperance, debasing exhibitions, and the system of licensed prostitution. The influence of Christianity is being felt in many ways that can not be tabulated. Partly because many literary men are Christians, or have been educated in Christian schools, Biblical quotations, theistic expressions, and arguments based on religious thought are common in newspapers and magazines. This shows that, in addition to what is visible to the eye, the leaven of Christian truth is silently working in the hearts of men. Apart from the directly religious results produced by the preaching of the Gospel, society is being in many ways affected by Christian ideas. No one can understand modern Japan who overlooks the influence that Christianity is exerting upon the thoughts and sentiments of the people.

OTIS CARY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. von Wenckstern, *Bibliography of the Japanese Empire, 1859–93*, vol. i., Leyden, 1895; vol. ii., Tokyo, 1907. On I. consult: F. Kaempfer, *Hist. of Japan*, 2 vols., London, 1728, new ed., 3 vols., New York, 1906; H. Faulds, *Nine Years in Nipon*, Boston, 1888; P. Lowell, *The Soul of the Far East*, ib. 1888; E. Lamairesse, *Le Japon, histoire, religion*, Paris, 1892; H. Norman, *Real Japan: Studies in Contemporary Manners, Morals, Administration and Politics*, New York, 1893; D. Murray, *The Story of Japan*, ib. 1894; J. Page, *Japan, its People and Missions*, London, 1895; C. Munzinger, *Die Japaner*, Berlin, 1898; W. G. Aston, *History of Japanese Literature*, New York, 1899; F. Brinkley, *Japan*, Boston, 1902; B. H. Chamberlain, *Things Japanese*, New York, 1902; W. E. Griffis, *Japan in History, Folklore and Art*, Boston, 1906; idem, *Mikado's Empire*, 2 vols., New York, 1903; idem, *The Japanese Nation in Evolution*, ib., 1907; Augusta M. C. Davidson, *Present Day Japan*, Philadelphia, 1904; S. Gulick, *Evolution of the Japanese, Social and Psychic*, New York, 1903; L. Hearn, *Japan: an Attempt at Interpretation*, London, 1904; G. W. Knox, *Japanese Life in Town and Country*, New York,

1904; idem, *Imperial Japan: the Country and its People*, London, 1905; I. O. Nitobe, *Bushido, the Soul of Japan*, New York, 1905; Mrs. E. Bickersteth, *Japan*, 1908.

On II, 1, consult: the *Kojiki*, transl. by B. H. Chamberlain, the supplement to *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, vol. x., 1882; the *Nihongi*, transl. by W. G. Aston in the *Transactions of the Japan Society*, 1896; W. G. Aston, *Shinto*, New York, 1905; P. Lowell, *Occult Japan*, Boston, 1895; F. Rinder, *Old World Japan: Legends of the Land of Gods*, New York, 1895; J. Batchelor, *The Ainu and their Folklore*, London, 1901; F. Brinkley, *Japan*, ut sup.; W. E. Griffis, *The Religions of Japan*, New York, 1904; M. Revon, *Le Shintoisme*, Paris, 1907; G. W. Knox, *The Development of Religion in Japan*, New York, 1907; E. Buckley, *Phallicism in Japan*, Chicago, privately printed. There are many papers of importance in the *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, e.g., E. Satow, *The Shinto Temples of Ise*, ii. 113; idem, *The Revival of Pure Shinto*, iii. appendix; idem, *Ancient Japanese Rituals*, iv. 409, vii. 97, ix. 183; P. Lowell, *Esoteric Shinto*, xxi.–xxii.; D. C. Greene, *Tenrikyo*, xxiii. 24; K. Florenz, *Ancient Japanese Ritual*, xxvii. 1; A. Lloyd and D. C. Greene, *The Remmonkyo*, xxiv. 1, 17; J. Leo, *Die Entwickelung des ältesten japanischen Seelenlebens*, Leipsic, 1907.

On II, 2, consult: B. Nanjio, *A Short Hist. of the Twelve Japanese Buddhist Sects*, Tokyo, 1886; *World's Parliament of Religions*, 2 vols., Chicago, 1893; L. Hearn, *Gleanings in Buddha Fields*, Boston, 1897; idem, *Japan, an Interpretation*, ut sup.; F. Brinkley, ut sup.; W. E. Griffis, *The Religions of Japan*, ut sup.; and the following papers in the *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan:* J. M. James, *Notes on Rosaries used by Different Sects of Buddhists*, ix. 173; J. Troup, *On the Tenets of Shinshiu*, xiv. 1; J. Summers, *Buddhism and Traditions concerning its Introduction into Japan*, xiv. 73; J. Troup, *The Gobunsho*, xvii. 101; A. Lloyd, *Developments of Japanese Buddhism*, xxii. 337.

On III, 1, the most valuable sources of information are to be found in the letters and reports of the missionaries, of which J. Hay gives many in *De rebus Japonicis*, Antwerp, 1605. Consult: Abbé de Talon (J. Crasset), *Hist. de l'église du Japon*, 2 vols., Paris, 1689, Eng. transl., London, 1705; P. F. Charlevoix, *Hist. et description générale du Japon*, 9 vols., Rouen, 1736; idem, *Hist. du christianisme au Japon*, 2 vols., ib. 1715; L. Pages, *Hist. de la religion chrétienne au Japon*, 2 vols., Paris, 1869; *Le Premier Missionaire catholique du Japon au xix. siècle*, Lyons, 1885 (largely composed of the letters of T. A. Forcade); F. Marnas, *La Religion de Jésus ressuscitée au Japon*, 2 vols., Paris, 1896; B. A. Wilberforce, *Dominican Missions and Martyrs in Japan*, London, 1897; J. Murdoch and Y. Yamagata, *History of Japan 1542–1651*, Kobé, 1903; M. Steichen, *The Christian Daimyo*, Yokohama, 1903; part of the literature under FRANCIS XAVIER; also the letters and reports in *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith* and *Catholic Missions*, periodicals published in London.

On III, 2, consult: C. Hale, *Missions of the Russian Church*, in *American Church Review*, Oct., 1878; G. W. Taft, *Bishop Nicolai*, in *Japanese Evangelist*, June, 1896; The first two volumes of a compendious history in Japanese, *Nihon Seikyo Dendo Shi*, were published Tokyo, 1900.

On III, 3, consult: *Proceedings of the General Conference of Protestant Missionaries of Japan*, Yokohama, 1883; *General Conference of Protestant Missionaries of Japan*, Tokyo, 1901; H. Ritter, *Dreissig Jahre protestantischer Mission in Japan*, Berlin, 1890, Eng. transl., *History of Protestant Missions in Japan*, Tokyo, 1898; M. L. Gordon, *An American Missionary in Japan*, Boston, 1892; Jinzo Naruse, *A Modern Paul in Japan: Account of the Life and Work of Rev. P. Sawayana*, ib. 1893; R. B. Peery, *The Gist of Japan*, New York, 1897; idem, *Lutherans in Japan*, Newberry, S. C., 1900; A. D. Hail, *Japan and its Rescue*, Nashville, 1898; E. Stock, *Japan and the Japan Mission of the Church Missionary Society*, London, 1898; O. Cary, *Japan and its Regeneration*, New York, 1904; W. E. Griffis, *Dux Christus*, ib. 1904; H. Moore, *The Christian Faith in Japan*, London, 1904; E. W. Clement, *Christianity in Modern Japan*, Philadelphia, 1905; H. K. Miller, *Hist. of the Japan Mission of the Reformed Church, 1879–1904*, ib. 1905; A. Arnold, *The Light of Japan. Church Work in . . . South Tokyo, Osaka, and Kiushiu under the Church of England*, Hartford, 1906; W. M. Imbrie, *The Church of Christ in Japan*, Philadelphia, 1906; *The Christian Movement in its Relation to the New Life of Japan*, an annual published in Tokyo, 1903 sqq.; R. Allier, *Le Protestantisme au Japon*, Paris, 1908; O. Cary, *Hist. of Christianity in Japan*, New York, 1909.

JAPHET. See TABLES OF THE NATIONS, § 4.

JASON: A Greek name borne often by Jews of Maccabean or later times and by Jewish Christians. On account of its resemblance to the Hebrew-Jewish name Jesus or Joshua, it was often assumed by Jews inclined to Greek culture or living in a Greek environment. The following are notable bearers of the name.

1. A brother of the high priest Onias III., himself occupying the office 174–172 B.C. Two very different accounts of him exist, the first in II Macc. iv. 7 sqq., v. 5 sqq. (cf. i. 7), and the second in Josephus, *Ant.* XII., v. 1 (cf. XV., iii. 1). According to the first account, Jason became an apostate from the Jewish religion, bought from Antiochus IV. the office of high priest for 440 talents, and for 150 more the right to erect in Jerusalem training-places for Greek athletics and to enroll Jerusalemites as citizens of Antioch. He encouraged Greek sports, and sent an embassy with a gift to the Heracles-Melcarth festival at Tyre. After three years he was superseded by Menelaus, who outbid him for the office. He fled to the Ammonites across the Jordan, but returned in 170 B.C. with a band of 1,000 men, when a report was spread that Antiochus had died on his second Egyptian expedition, took Jerusalem, and inflicted great slaughter there. He was compelled again to flee, first to the Ammonites, then to the Arabian Prince Aretas, next to Egypt, and finally to Lacedemonia, where he died. According to Josephus he came into the office in an orderly manner, after the death of his brother, fell into disfavor with Antiochus, and was compelled to yield his office to his brother Menelaus, who was the real sponsor for Greek culture. Willrich accepts Josephus' account on the ground that II Maccabees is a falsified "tendency-writing," but the majority of scholars are against this.

2. The son of Eleazar, who, according to I Macc. viii. 17 (cf. II Macc. iv. 11 and Josephus, *Ant.* XII., x. 6), was sent about 161 B.C. with Eupolemus to Rome by Judas Maccabeus as ambassador to make a treaty of friendship. The treaty was made, though its results were not actually apparent. Willrich casts doubts upon the historicity of the event.

3. Jason of Cyrene, a Hellenistic Jew who, according to II Macc. ii. 19, wrote a history in Greek in five books on the Maccabees, the purification of the temple, the wars of the Jews against Antiochus Epiphanes and Eupator, and the divine help which came in those times. It embraced the period 171–161 B.C., and is the basis of II Maccabees, the author of which lays the responsibility for his form of statement of the facts upon Jason, though probably Jason is also a mask through which his own personality speaks. Jason wrote between 162 and 125 B.C., and probably in Egypt.

4. In Rom. xvi. 21 Paul speaks of a kinsman Jason, who possibly lived in Corinth (cf. Rom. xvi. 1).

5. According to Acts xvii. 5–9, Paul, while at Thessalonica, dwelt at the house of a Jason, who is probably to be distinguished from the foregoing.

6. For the Jason of the " Dialogue between Jason and Papiscus " see ARISTO OF PELLA.

(R. KRÄTZSCHMAR†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A treatment of the whole subject may be found in *DB*, ii. 551–552; *EB*, ii. 2336–37; and of 1–3 in *JE*, vii. 74–75.

For 1 consult: H. Willrich, *Juden und Griechen vor der makkabäischen Erhebung*, Göttingen, 1895; A. P. Stanley, *Lectures on the Hist. of the Jewish Church*, iii. 324, London, 1884; J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, p. 325, Berlin, 1895; A. Büchler, *Die Tobiaden und die Oniaden*, pp. 106 sqq., Vienna, 1899; Schürer, *Geschichte*, i. 220, 194–196, Eng. transl., I., i. 202–205, 231 (on 1 and 2).

On 3: Trieber, in *Nachrichten der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 1895, pp. 401, 408; Willrich, ut sup., chap. ii.; idem, *Judaica*, chap. iv., Göttingen, 1900; A. Schlatter, in *Festschrift der Universität Greifswald*, Greifswald, 1899; Schürer, ut sup., i. 40, 359–361, Eng. transl., I., i. 47, II., iii. 211–216.

On 5 consult: W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 231, London, 1897.

JASPER, JOHN: Colored Baptist pulpit orator; b. a slave on the Peachy plantation on the James River, in Fluvanna Co., Virginia, July 4, 1812; d. in Richmond, Va., Mar. 30, 1901. His father was Philip Jasper, his mother's name was Nina, and he was her twenty-fourth child, born two months after his father's death. When grown to manhood he came to Richmond as a slave and was employed as a stemmer in the large tobacco factory of Samuel Hargrove, a prominent Baptist. He had no education, but with the help of a colored man almost as ignorant as himself he learned to read six months before his conversion, which occurred on Thursday, July 25, 1839. His father had been a preacher, and he followed his example. He soon became a favorite among the colored people of Richmond, then his fame spread, especially as a funeral preacher, until he was known all over the State. He made himself master of the Bible, and was a formidable opponent of those who questioned his interpretation. When emancipated he gathered about him a congregation and soon had a building to preach in. More and more came to hear him until at length the Sixth Mount Zion Church was built for him, and there he preached to several thousand people every Sunday. In 1878, in the regular course of his ministry, he preached from Ex. xv. 3, " The Lord is a man of war; the Lord is his name." He began with Biblical illustrations of the almighty power of God, but branched off into the demonstration by Biblical texts literally construed of the proposition that " the sun do move." The sermon was prepared to end a dispute upon the question of the sun's motion and was delivered without any desire to cause talk. It made a sensation, had to be repeated again and again, and he was even sent out by a lecture bureau to repeat it outside of Richmond. But it only made his name a by-word and obscured to many the fact that he really had solid claim to be considered a pulpit orator. Even this particular sermon was saved from being ridiculous by the preacher's profound reverence for the Bible, simple faith in the Bible miracles, and his logical power and remarkable eloquence of a rude but genuine kind. He had also humor of the most delicious variety. In short, in him the type of the ante-bellum uneducated but gifted, pious, and witty colored preacher reached its culmination.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. E. Hatcher, *John Jasper*, New York, 1908.

JASPIS, ALBERT SIGISMUND: General superintendent of Pomerania; b. at Nossen (19 m. w. of Dresden) Feb. 15, 1809; d. at Stettin Dec. 20, 1885. He studied at the gymnasium in Freiburg-on-the-Mulde and at Leipsic. In 1832 he became catechist and afternoon-preacher in St. Peter's Church in Leipsic. In 1835 Jaspis became pastor in Lugau, three years later diaconus in Lichtenstein, and pastor in Rödlitz. His faithfulness and especially his success with children and young people won him the hearts of his parishioners in both places. In 1845 he went over to the Prussian State Church, after having been elected third preacher of the Evangelical Lutheran congregation in Elberfeld. In 1855 he was called to Stettin as general superintendent of Pomerania. He represented a pietistic confessionalism, and his gifts lay in the direction of the practical cure of souls. He was not without success as a writer of devotional and pastoral literature, and some of his tracts found a large circulation. But the publication which carried his name far beyond the borders of Evangelical Germany was his compilation of Luther's small catechism for the instruction of young people to be confirmed. This booklet is one of the most successful attempts at the solution of the catechetical problem of the Church as it was conceived in the middle of the nineteenth century in the circles of pietistic confessionalism.

(HANS KESSLER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sketches were written by his son, one prefixed to Jaspis' *Erinnerungen an eine Zeit wo es trübe und finster war*, Cologne, 1888, the other in *Bilder aus dem kirchlichen Leben . . . in Pommern*, pp. 205 sqq., Stettin, 1895.

JAUFFRET, zhō″frê′, **GASPARD JEAN ANDRÉ JOSEPH:** Bishop of Metz; b. at Roque-Brussane (15 m. n. of Toulon), Provence, Dec. 13, 1759; d. in Paris May 13, 1823. He studied at Toulon, Aix, and Paris, where, in 1791, he established the *Annales de la religion et du sentiment* to oppose the civil constitution of the clergy. After the Revolution he was one of the principal collaborators on the *Annales religieuses*. About 1801 he became vicar-general of Lyons. Subsequently he was recalled to Paris as secretary of the grand almonry. He became bishop of Metz in 1806. In 1811 he was appointed by Napoleon to the archbishopric of Aix, but was never instituted. His best-known works are: *De la religion à l'Assemblée Nationale* (Paris, 1790); *Du culte public* (2 vols., 1795); *Meditations sur les souffrances de la croix de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ* (1800), and *Entretiens sur le sacrement de la confirmation* (1809).

JAVAN: A designation common to the Old Testament and the entire Orient for Greeks in general and those of Asia Minor in particular. The name is an example of a tribal name being given to a whole people, and the Hebrew (*Yawan*) form corresponds to the Greek *Iaones* or *IaFones*. In an inscription of Sargon II. (722–705 B.C.), also in one of the Indian King Asoka, the name occurs as *Javana,* and on one of Darius as *Jauna.* The reason why all Greeks were called Ionians in the Orient is that after the eighth century before Christ the Ionians controlled the commerce of the East.

Old-Testament mention is found in Ezek. xxvii. 13, where Javan is mentioned with Tubal and Meshech, and refers probably to the Ionians settled in Asia Minor on the coast of the Black Sea; Isa. lxvi. 19 (Septuagint) connects Lud, Meshech, Tubal, and Javan; Javan in Ezek. xxvii. 19 is a corruption of the text, as the Septuagint shows. The word has the general sense of "Greeks" in Gen. x. 2, 4; in verse 2 they are connected with Tubal and Meshech, but in verse 4 the term includes Elishah (probably Sicily), Tarshish in Spain, Kittim (Cyprus), and Rodanim (see DODANIM), and therefore covers the people of the Mediterranean. The priestly writer who wrote this verse knew of the supersession of the Phenicians by the Greeks, in commercial matters. Joel iii. 6 mentions the Greeks, Zech. ix. 13 speaks of the Greek empire, Dan. viii. 21 has in mind Alexander's kingdom, and x. 20 that of the Seleucidæ. (H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: B. Stade, *De populo Javan,* Giessen, 1880, also in *Reden und Abhandlungen,* pp. 123–142, ib. 1899; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums,* i. 490–494, ii. 433, 685 sqq., Stuttgart, 1884–93; A. H. Sayce, *Higher Criticism and the Monuments,* London, 1894; *DB,* ii. 552–553; *EB,* ii. 2338–39; also literature under TABLE OF THE NATIONS.

JAY, WILLIAM: English dissenting preacher and author; b. at Tisbury (13 m. w. of Salisbury), Wiltshire, May 8, 1769; d. at Bath Dec. 27, 1853. After serving for two years as apprentice to his father, a stonecutter and mason, he entered the religious seminary of Cornelius Winter at Marlborough in 1785, and began to preach in the neighboring villages the same year. On leaving Marlborough in 1788 he preached at Surrey Chapel, London, and achieved considerable notoriety as the "boy preacher." After short ministries at Christian Malford, near Chippenham, and Hope Chapel, Clifton, he became pastor of the Argyle Independent Chapel at Bath Jan. 30, 1791. He retired from this pastorate sixty-two years later. His preaching attracted hearers from all classes and from all denominations. John Foster calls him the prince of preachers, and Sheridan styles him the most natural orator he had ever heard. Some of his writings have been widely circulated and frequently reprinted in America. His best-known works are: *The Mutual Duties of Husbands and Wives* (London, 1801); *An Essay on Marriage* (Bath, 1806); *The Domestic Minister's Assistant* (London, 1820); *The Christian Contemplated* (1826); *Morning Exercises in the Closet* (2 vols., 1829); and *Evening Exercises for the Closet* (2 vols., 1831). His *Works* (12 vols., Bath, 1842–48) were edited by himself.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His *Autobiography,* ed. G. Redford and J. A. James, appeared London, 1855. Consult T. Wallace, *Portraiture of W. Jay,* ib. 1854; S. Wilson, *Memoir of W. Jay,* ib. 1854; C. Jay, *Recollections of William Jay,* ib. 1859 (by his son); *DNB,* xxix. 255–256.

JAYNE, FRANCIS JOHN: Church of England bishop of Chester; b. at Llanelly (15 m. s.e. of Carmarthen), Carmarthenshire, South Wales, Jan. 1, 1845. He was educated at Wadham College, Oxford (B.A., 1868), and became deacon and priest in 1870. He was fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, 1868–73, and lecturer in the same college and tutor of Keble College, Oxford, 1871–79. He was curate of St. Clement's, Oxford, 1870–71; principal of St. David's College, Lampeter, as well as sinecure rector of Llangeler, 1877–86; rural dean of Lampeter, 1885–86; vicar and rural dean of Leeds, 1886–88; and was consecrated bishop of Chester in 1889. He was also Whitehall Preacher, 1875–77, and select preacher at Oxford in 1884.

JE: The product resulting, according to the critical school, from the union of the J document and the E document in the Hexateuch (q.v.). See HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, II., §§ 4, 7.

JEALOUSY, TRIAL OF. See ORDEAL.

JEANNE D'ALBRET, zhān dāl″brê′: Queen of Navarre; b. at Pau (56 m. e.s.e. of Bayonne) Jan. 7, 1528; d. at Paris June 9, 1572. She was the eldest child of Henry of Navarre and Margaret of Angoulême-Alençon, the sister of Francis I. of France. By the death of her brother John, she became heir-presumptive of Navarre-Béarn, a kingdom which was important on account of its position between France and Spain. She received a thorough education, although her trend was practical and ambitious rather than scholarly, nor could she sympathize with the intellectualism and mysticism of her famous mother. Suitors for her hand were numerous, and as early as 1535 Francis had intended to marry her to Anthony of Bourbon, but when, in 1540, Charles V. of Spain sought her as a wife for his son Philip, her uncle decided to wed her to Duke William of Cleves. Despite her resistance, the ceremony was performed on June 14, 1541, but her youth made the marriage a mere form, and her ill health obliged her to remain in France while her husband returned to Germany. The change of political conditions caused Francis to desire an annulment of the marriage, and a brief of Paul III. on Oct. 12, 1545, declared the enforced wedlock void. Three years later (Oct. 20, 1548) she married Duke Anthony of Bourbon-Vendôme. The first two children of this union died while still infants, but on Dec. 14, 1553, she gave birth at Pau to her son Henry, afterward Henry IV. of France. The death of her father on May 29, 1555, made her queen of Navarre, and she succeeded in having Anthony recognized as king, although the actual sovereignty devolved on her.

It was in her relation to the Reformation that Jeanne was most important. She had been brought up in an atmosphere favorable to the new teaching, although Margaret of Navarre never formally became a convert to Protestantism. Jeanne remained true to Roman Catholicism, even after her husband entered into correspondence with Calvin in 1557, and became the mainstay of the Reformed. Her disaffection with the Roman Catholic Church, however, steadily increased, and on Christmas of the same year she publicly renounced her former faith and received communion according to the Reformed rite. Within a year her court became the center of the Reformed, and her zeal for her new creed and its adherents was most pronounced. She educated her son in the Reformed faith, and Navarre was thoroughly Calvinized by Raymond Merlin in 1563–64. Many statues were forcibly torn from the churches, and the monasteries were transformed into schools, while their incomes were devoted to the establishment of educational institutions.

A sudden opponent arose, however, in the person of Pius IV., who, in a bull of Sept. 28, 1563, cited her to appear before the tribunal of the Inquisition or to forfeit her territories both for herself and her children. This peril was obviated by her suzerain, Charles IX., and the bull was annulled, but the peace which she now hoped to enjoy was broken by the wars of religion which broke out anew, and she was forced to flee from Navarre and to take refuge in La Rochelle. During the war she was untiring in her encouragement of her coreligionists, and her son Henry (then sixteen years of age) was the nominal head of the Huguenot party, with Coligny and Andelot as his advisers, a course by which Jeanne increased her own prestige. Meanwhile Navarre-Béarn had been overrun by the royal troops under Terrides, Pau was captured, and only the little fortress of Navarrein still held out. Thither Jeanne sent Montgomery, who reconquered the country for its queen within two months. Jeanne thereupon forbade the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion, and expelled the priests and monks, but in Navarre, where her power was limited, she tolerated it. In the Peace of St. Germain (Aug. 8, 1570) her counsels and perseverance were important factors in obtaining favorable terms for the Protestants, and she remained at La Rochelle until Aug., 1571, declining to be present at the marriage of Charles IX. with Elizabeth of Austria (Nov. 26, 1570), but attending the third Reformed synod held at La Rochelle Apr. 2–10, 1571.

Though she had pleaded the length of the journey, she was, in reality, deeply distrustful of the court, and repeatedly declined invitations to visit it, despite the fact that she was planning a marriage of her son with Margaret, the daughter of Henry II. This match had been proposed by Henry himself as early as 1556, but had been forgotten until negotiations were renewed during the war in the autumn of 1569, and again in Jan., 1571, this time in earnest. In Nov. the reluctance of Jeanne was overcome, despite the difference in religion of Henry and Margaret, for she hoped that the princess would become a convert to Protestantism. In Jan., 1572, the queen of Navarre consented to visit the French court, and in the following month met Catharine. Negotiations for the marriage dragged, but in April it was decided that the ceremony should be performed at Paris. On Apr. 11 the marriage-contract was signed, but the pope would not give the requisite dispensation, although Charles IX. earnestly advocated the union which was so necessary for the peace of the land. Jeanne then hastened to Paris to make the final preparations for the marriage, and on June 3 received communion at Vincennes with a number of her coreligionists, but died six days later. It was this marriage which was followed by the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day.

(THEODOR SCHOTT†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best account, based on documentary evidence, of the life of Jeanne d'Albret is in the three works of A. de Ruble, *Le Mariage de Jeanne d'Albret*, Paris, 1877, *Ant. de Bourbon et Jeanne d'Albret*, 4 vols., ib. 1881–86, and *Jeanne d'Albret et la guerre civile*, ib. 1897; for her later life very important is *Lettres d'Antoine de Bourbon et de Jeanne d'Albret*, ib. 1877. Consult further: W. G. Soldan, *Geschichte des Protestantismus in Frankreich*, 2 vols., Gotha, 1855; G. von Polenz, *Geschichte des französischen Calvinismus*, 5 vols., Leipsic, 1857–69; N. de Boodenave, *Hist. de Béarn et Navarre*, Paris, 1873; J. Delaborde, *Eléonore de Roye*, ib. 1876; idem, *Gaspard de Coligny*, vol. i., ib. 1879; H. M. Baird, *Hist. of the Rise of the Huguenots*, 2 vols., New York, 1880; *Cambridge Modern History*, iii. 6, 11, 13, 17–18, New York, 1905.

JEBB, JOHN: Bishop of Limerick; b. at Drogheda (26 m. n. of Dublin), Ireland, Sept. 27, 1775; d. at East Hill, near Wandsworth (6 m. s.w. of London), Surrey, Dec. 9, 1833. He studied at the Londonderry grammar-school, and in 1791 entered Trinity College, Dublin (M.A., 1801; B.D. and D.D., 1821). He was ordained in 1799 and instituted to the curacy of Mogorbane, Tipperary county, in 1801. He became Archbishop Brodrick's examining chaplain in 1805 and archdeacon of Emly in 1820. For his services in maintaining order in his parish during the disturbances that followed the famine of 1822 he was rewarded with the bishopric of Limerick in Dec. of that year. In 1827 a stroke of paralysis incapacitated him for active work. Thereafter he resided at various places in England, devoting himself to literary pursuits. He had a strong tendency toward High-church ritual, and is regarded as a forerunner of the Oxford movement. His chief works are: *Sermons* (London, 1815); *Sacred Literature* (1820); *Practical Theology* (2 vols., 1830); and a *Biographical Memoir of William Phelan* (1832). His correspondence with Alexander Knox was edited by C. Forster (2 vols., 1834).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. Forster, *Life and Letters of John Jebb*, London, 1851; Anne Mozley, *Letters of J. H. Newman*, i. 440, 470, ib. 1890; *DNB*, xxix. 259–261.

JEBUS, jî'bus, **JEBUSITES**, jeb'u-saits: Upon the basis of Judges xix. 10–11 and I Chron. xi. 4–5 Jebus was formerly supposed to have been the pre-Israelitic name of Jerusalem (cf. II Sam. v. 6). But Judges xix.–xxi. took its present form in post-exilic times, and probably Jebus did not occur in the original text; consequently the testimony for Jebus as the name of a city is late, for in all early narratives only the name Jerusalem is found, as it is in the Amarna Tablets (see AMARNA TABLETS, III.). The passages cited, therefore, embody the erroneous conclusion that the earlier name of the city was Jebus. It is to be noted, however, that the Jebusites were not spoken of as limited in their dwelling-place to the city, but as inhabiting the immediate region thereabout (II Sam. v. 6) or the mountain region in particular (Num. xiii. 29; Josh. xi. 3). The better conclusion therefore is that the people derived its name from a district rather than a city. They are represented as holding an important point in the highland after Israel had carried on a victorious campaign against the Canaanites, and from the mountain fortress of Zion ruling a small territory limited on the north by the Benjaminitic Nob, Gibeah of Saul, and Ramah, and on the south by Bethlehem of Judah. Their independence was not especially important until the time of David, when he wished to unite his northern and his southern territories, and therefore captured the place (II Sam. v. 6–8; I Chron. xi. 4–6). After that they were in part freemen on their own possessions (implied by the story of Araunah or Ornan, II Sam. xxiv. 16; I Chron. xxi. 15), and in part slaves (under Solomon, I Kings ix. 20–21). The text of the description of the boundary between Judah and Benjamin calls the hill north of the Valley of Hinnom " the Shoulder of the Jebusites " (Josh. xv. 8, xviii. 16), whence it may be concluded that the part of the city which the Jebusites occupied in later times was that to the southeast. It might be concluded from Josh. x. 5 that as Adonizedek is reckoned to the Amorites the Jebusites were also Amorites; but this is not conclusive, as it may be held that the Amorites had recently come in, while the Jebusites were regarded as early inhabitants of the land. From the frequent mention of the people (e.g., Gen. x. 16; Deut. vii. 1, xx. 17) nothing certain can be gathered regarding the racial affinities of the Jebusites. (H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The subject is treated in the literature under AMARNA TABLETS and JERUSALEM. Consult also: G. F. Moore, *Commentary on Judges*, New York, 1895; K. Budde, *Das Buch der Richter*, Göttingen, 1896; *DB*, ii. 554–555; *EB*, ii. 2415–16.

JEFFERS, ELIAKIM TUPPER: Presbyterian; b. at Stewiacke, Nova Scotia, Apr. 6, 1841. He studied at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa. (B.A., 1862), and Princeton Theological Seminary (1862–1865), and at the United Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Alleghany, Pa (1865–66). He was pastor of the United Presbyterian Church at Oxford, Pa. (1865–72), after which he was president of Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa., until 1890, and professor of theology in Lincoln University, Oxford, Pa (1883–90). He was pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Oil City, Pa. (1890–93) and since 1893 has been president of the York Collegiate Institute, York, Pa. He has written *Shortest Road to Cæsar* (New York, 1896).

JEFFERS, WILLIAM HAMILTON: Presbyterian; b. at Cadiz, O., May 1, 1838. He was graduated from Geneva College, Northwood, Pa. (now Beaver Falls, O.; A.B., 1855), and at the United Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Xenia, O. (1859). He was pastor of the combined United Presbyterian churches of Bellefontaine and Northwood, O. (1862–1866); was professor of Latin and Hebrew in Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa. (1866–69); professor of Greek in the University of Wooster, Wooster, O. (1869–75); pastor of the Euclid Avenue Presbyterian Church, Cleveland, O. (1875–77); and professor of historical theology in the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany, Pa. (1877–1903). He has since resided at Los Angeles, Cal., and lectures on church history. While at Bellefontaine he was a member of the committee to revise the United Presbyterian metrical version of the Psalms.

JEFFERSON, CHARLES EDWARD: Congregationalist; b. at Cambridge, O., Aug. 29, 1860. He was educated at Ohio Wesleyan University (A.B., 1882); was superintendent of public schools in Worthington, O. (1882–84); studied at the School of Theology attached to Boston University (1884–1887). He was pastor of the Central Congregational Church, Chelsea, Mass., from 1887 to 1898. Since 1898 he has been pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City. He has written: *Quiet Talks with Earnest People in My Study* (New York, 1898); *Quiet Hints to Growing Preachers in My Study* (1901); *Doctrine and Deed* (1901); *Things Fundamental* (1903); *Faith and Life* (1905); *The Minister as Prophet* (1905); *The New Crusade* (1907); *The Old Year and the New* (1907); *Character of Jesus* (1908); and *My Father's Business: Series of Sermons to Children* (1909).

JEHOAHAZ, je-hō′a-haz: **1.** Eleventh king of Israel, son and successor of Jehu. His dates, according to the old chronology, are 856–840 B.C.; according to Kautzsch, 814–798 B.C. Under him the oppression of the northern kingdom by the Arameans reached its height, the army being reduced to fifty horsemen, ten chariots, and 10,000 foot soldiers. An addition to II Kings xiii. 22 in the Septuagint shows that the Arameans operated from the southwest as well as from the north against Jehoahaz. Under him the Asherah worship seems to have revived (II Kings xiii. 6).

2. Sixteenth king of Judah, third son and successor of Josiah (called Shallum, Jer. xxii. 11). He reigned only three months, according to the old chronology, in 610 B.C.; according to Kautzsch, 609 B.C.; according to Peake, 608 B.C. He was evidently regarded as more energetic than his elder brother (see JEHOIAKIM), since the people elevated him to the throne; but both the Book of Kings and Josephus give him a bad character (II Kings xxiii. 30 sqq.; *Ant.* X., v. 2). Pharaoh Necho, on his return from his campaign to the Euphrates, summoned Jehoahaz to Riblah and threw him into chains to be carried to Egypt, whence he never returned, and put his brother Jehoiakim (Eliakim) in his place as king. Whether the name Shallum (=" retribution "?) was symbolically applied or was his original name, discarded when he became king, is a subject of debate. [The list of Josiah's sons in I Chron. iii. 17–18 erroneously makes Shallum to be a different person from Jehoahaz.]

The name appears also in II Chron. xxi. 17 as that of King Ahaziah of Judah, and also, II Chron. xxxiv. 8, of a recorder under Josiah of Judah. (E. KAUTZSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: II Kings xiii. 1–9, xxiii. 30–35; II Chron. iii. 17–18, xxxvi. 1–3; Jer. xxii. 10–12. Consult the pertinent sections of the histories mentioned under AHAB; and ISRAEL, HISTORY OF; and the articles in *DB*, *EB*, and *JE*.

JEHOIACHIN, je-hoi′a-kin: Eighteenth king of Judah, son and successor of Jehoiakim. He reigned only three months, in 598 B.C. according to the old chronology, 597 B.C. according to nearly all modern historians. The difference in his age at his accession and in the length of his reign as given in II Kings xxiv. 8 and II Chron. xxxvi. 9 is probably due to a shifting in the Chronicler's narrative of the numeral ten from his age to the length of his reign. When Jehoiachin ascended the throne, Jerusalem was already under siege by the Babylonians or was besieged soon after, and he rendered himself prisoner to the besiegers, with his household and his officers, and was carried into exile to Babylon, where he remained a prisoner until Evil-Merodach set him free in 562 (II Kings xxiv. 10–15, xxv. 27 sqq.) and gave him an honorable place at the court of Babylon. (E. Kautzsch.)

Bibliography: Sources are II Kings xxiv. 8–15, xxv. 27–30; II Chron. xxxvi. 9–10; Jer. xxii., xxiv., xxvii.–xxix. Consult the pertinent sections in the works on the history of Israel cited under Ahab, and the articles in the Bible dictionaries; J. W. Rothstein, *Die Genealogie des Königs Jojachin und seiner Nachkommen*, Berlin, 1902.

JEHOIADA, je-hoi'a-da: High priest in the time of Athaliah and Joash, king of Judah. His wife, Jehosheba, sister of Ahaziah, saved Joash from death at the time of the slaughter of the seed royal by Athaliah. Six years after that event Jehoiada set Joash on the throne, and had Athaliah killed. He followed this up by destruction of the Baal temple and the slaying of the priest of Baal, and renewed the service in the temple of Yahweh. While Jehoiada was practically regent during the minority of Joash, the independence of the king on reaching maturity is indicated in II Kings xii. 7. The Chronicler relates that Jehoiada died at the age of 130 and was buried among the kings because of his good deeds (II Chron. xxiv. 15–16).

Others of the name are the father of Benaiah, one of David's heroes, and a son of Eliashib, a priest among the returning exiles named in Neh. xii. 10 sqq. (E. Kautzsch.)

Bibliography: Sources are II Kings xi.–xii. 16; II Chron. xxii. 10–xxiv. 16. Consult the pertinent sections in the works on the History of Israel mentioned under Ahab, and the articles in the Bible Dictionaries.

JEHOIAKIM, je-hoi'a-kim: Seventeenth king of Judah, second son of Josiah, and successor of Jehoahaz. His dates, according to the old chronology, are 609–598 B.C.; according to recent authorities 608–597 B.C. He was set on the throne by Pharaoh Necho in place of his brother Jehoahaz (q.v.), and his name changed from Eliakim. Through the defeat of Necho at Carchemish the Egyptian overlordship of Hither Asia was broken and the Judeans came practically under the sway of the Babylonians, though not for some time did a Babylonian force appear in the land. After remaining a vassal of Nebuchadrezzar for three years, Jehoiakim rebelled, doubtless at the instigation of Egypt, while the neighboring Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites were encouraged to ravage his territory. Finally Jerusalem was besieged by the Babylonians, and possibly during the siege Jehoiakim died (II Kings xxiv. 6), though the Chronicler reports that Nebuchadrezzar put him in chains, which may be due to a confusion of Jehoiakim with his successor, or to an omission indicated in the Septuagint, which adds to II Chron. xxxvi. 8 "and buried him in the garden of Uzza." Ewald is of the opinion that the difficulties occasioned both by the brevity of the accounts and by their lack of agreement are solved by supposing that Jehoiakim was decoyed from the city, an assault made on him to take him prisoner, and that he was killed in the mêlée; in this way he accounts for the definiteness in the lamentation of Jeremiah.

Jehoiakim (Joiakim) is also the name of a post-exilic high priest (Neh. xii-10 sqq.), and (Joakim) of the husband of Susanna. (E. Kautzsch.)

In 609 B.C. Pharaoh Necho advanced from Egypt against Babylon. Josiah, king of Judah, as ally of Babylon met him at Megiddo, was defeated and slain (II Kings xxiii. 29). The people of Jerusalem then made Jehoahaz king, passing by the elder brother, Jehoiakim, with the purpose doubtless of continuing the pro-Babylonian policy of Josiah. Three months later Necho placed Jehoiakim upon the throne and carried Jehoahaz to Egypt. Jerusalem was distracted. The court party favored Egypt, but Jehoiakim was not the people's choice. The anti-Egyptian party was incensed at the fine which Necho imposed—not on the royal treasury, but on the inhabitants (II Kings xxiii. 34, 35), and Jeremiah earnestly warned against the Egyptian alliance (Jer. xxvi).

The Egyptian and Babylonian armies did not meet in 608, but the conflict was only postponed, and four years later, 605, Necho was back again. The intervening time was employed by Nebuchadrezzar in making alliances and suppressing enemies on the line of Necho's projected return. This appears from Berosus (Josephus, *Apion*, i. 19), who says that after the defeat of Necho at Carchemish in 605, "Nebuchadrezzar was sent by his father against the parts of Cœle-Syria and Phenicia which had revolted from him, and that he reduced the country under his dominion again." If they revolted they must have been in subordination of some sort. The interval 608 to 605 suggests itself as the time when that subordination took place. Judah was one of those countries. It had been friendly under Josiah. It must be made friendly under Josiah's son. The three years' vassalage (II Kings xxiv. 1) fits into this interval. It is a meaningless phrase applied to any other portion of Jehoiakim's reign. Jeremiah's silence also from the "beginning" of Jehoiakim's reign to the "fourth year" of that reign (Jer. xxxvi. 1) is consistent with friendly relations between Judah and Babylon. During this interval, i.e., in 606 B.C., the young nobles of Judah were taken to Babylon (Dan. i. 1) to be brought up at court—an arrangement designed to promote good feeling between the subordinate and the dominant powers. That these young men became captives along with their whole nation was due to Jehoiakim's folly.

But when, in 605, the tramp of the Egyptian army was heard again Jehoiakim put aside pretense and joined Necho. Necho's defeat at Carchemish threw the whole country into Nebuchadrezzar's hands. He punished the nations which had fallen away from allegiance to him by transporting some of their people to Mesopotamia (Josephus, ut sup.). Jerusalem was in great fear. A fast was proclaimed in Jehoiakim's fifth year (Jer. xxxvi. 9) and Nebuchadrezzar's vengeance did not fall immediately. Nebuchadrezzar contented himself with allowing bands of Chaldeans, Ammonites, and others to ravage Judah (II Kings xxiv. 2). The Jewish monarchy existed thereafter only on sufferance.

Jehoiakim reigned eleven years, dying in 597 B.C. He was not put to death by Nebuchadrezzar, as Josephus says, but may have perished by assassination, for he had filled Jerusalem with innocent blood and was a curse to his country.

JOSEPH D. WILSON.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are II Kings xxiii. 34–xxiv. 7; II Chron. xxxvi. 4–8; Jer. vii.–ix., x. 17–25, xiv.–xvii. 18, xviii.–xx., etc.; and the Book of Habakkuk. The subject is treated in the pertinent sections of the literature named under AHAB and in the Bible Dictionaries.

JEHOSHAPHAT, je-hesh'a-fat: Fourth king of Judah, son and successor of Asa. His dates, according to the old chronology, are 914–893 B.C.; according to Kamphausen, 876–852 B.C.; according to Duncker, 869–848 B.C.; according to Curtis (*DB*, i. 401), 876–851 B.C. He was an energetic ruler, whose extensive preparations for war and prudent measures (II Chron. xvii. 2, 12–13) induced Ahab of Israel to seek an alliance in view of the strained relations between Israel and the Syrians, and of the dangers arising from the pressure from the rising power of Assyria (e.g., the victory of Shalmaneser II. at Karkar; see ASSYRIA, VI., 3, § 8). Good relations with Israel were also desired by Jehoshaphat; accordingly he became only too intimate with the heathenized court of Samaria and sealed his friendship by arranging a marriage between his son Joram and Athaliah, daughter of Ahab and Jezebel. This alliance had its first test in an unsuccessful campaign against the Syrians, the object of which was to recapture the fortress of Ramoth in Gilead, which was important as the center of the country east of the Jordan (I Kings xxii. 1 sqq.). When Jehoshaphat returned he received a severe rebuke from the prophet Jehu, son of Hanani, for entering into relations with those whom the Lord hated (II Chron. xix. 1 sqq.; cf. II Chron. xx. 34). Nevertheless, moved by his continued desire for a closer connection with the northern kingdom, he was ready to undertake, in company with Joram (q.v.), another campaign against the Moabites, who had revolted from Israel (II Kings iii.). This expedition, to which Edom was also forced to furnish aid, marched through the desert of Edom around the southern end of the Dead Sea, and was threatened with defeat through the lack of water in this region, when Elisha, for Jehoshaphat's sake, gave counsel and promised rescue and victory. King Mesha, besieged in his fortress Kir-hareseth (the modern Kerak), in his dire extremity offered his son as a sacrifice to the national god, Chemosh, whereupon, according to the mysterious statement in II Kings iii. 27, "there was great indignation against Israel" (i.e. on the part of Chemosh) and the allies were forced to turn back, so that they returned home without having accomplished their task. The Chronicler, who omits this story and does not allude to the activity of the prophet Elisha, speaks (II Chron. xx.) of a defensive, but more successful, expedition of Jehoshaphat against the Ammonites, Moabites, and *Meunim* (cf. II Chron. xx. 1, R.V. margin, but read *Mehamme'unim*). As this expedition is mentioned only by the Chronicler, many critics maintain that his story is a readjustment of the events related in II Kings iii., and credit it with no historic value. Nevertheless, in view of the great difference in all the principal details, it is best regarded as an account of an independent act of Jehoshaphat.

Both earlier and later sources praise Jehoshaphat's piety and his reforming tendencies (I Kings xxii. 43, 46; II Chron. xvii. 3, 6, xix. 3). According to the Chronicler he was a zealous reformer of legal procedure (II Chron. xix. 5 sqq.), and sought to impress his judges with a true sense of their responsibilities. In each city of the land he established a court of justice, and in Jerusalem a supreme tribunal composed of the chiefs of the families, of Levites and of priests, entrusted with decision in the most difficult cases. In this tribunal a priest presided when the religious cases were tried, and a prince when the action was a civil one. Both sources tell of an unsuccessful mercantile venture of Jehoshaphat, though the narratives are not altogether concordant (I Kings xxii. 48; II Chron. xxi. 35, 37). He endeavored to reestablish the traffic to Ophir from Ezion-geber, but the newly equipped ships were wrecked by a storm.

The picture of Jehoshaphat, although not without its shadows, is still the brightest presented by the house of David after Solomon's time. The land was densely populated (II Chron. xvii. 14 sqq.) and highly prosperous; little Judah was respected beyond her boundaries because of the wisdom and bravery of her king (II Chron. xvii. 10–11). Justice and religion flourished and developed, the sacred writings were carefully guarded and enriched. The king himself, another David in his piety, submitted to the sharp reproach of the prophets, was far-sighted, endowed with a noble, generous nature, and displayed tireless energy in his care for his people's welfare. That the condemnation of the well-meaning efforts of Jehoshaphat for a closer connection with the idolatrous royal house of Israel did not spring from narrow fanaticism was only too well proved immediately after his death, since the marriage of his son with Athaliah bore the worst possible fruits and robbed the land of the blessings which Jehoshaphat's reign had bestowed upon it.

C. VON ORELLI.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The sources are I Kings xxii.; II Kings iii.; II Chron. xvii.–xxi. 1. The literature is given under AHAB. Consult also: C. F. Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Kings*, Oxford, 1903; *DB*, ii. 561; *EB*, ii. 2352–2353, cf. i. 770; *JE*, vii. 86–87.

JEHOVAH, je-hō'vā: An erroneous form of the divine name of the covenant God of Israel which appears first about 1520 A.D. The error arose from the fact that the utterance of the divine name, in original quadrilateral form (the tetragrammaton) YHWH, became unlawful in Jewish usage as early as the third Christian century and probably much earlier, at least outside the sacred precincts (cf. Ex. xx. 7; Lev. xxiv. 16, the Septuagint of which reads " name the name " for " blaspheme the name "). Consequently in reading the sacred text, " Adonai " (Heb. *Adhonai*, " my lord ") was pronounced instead of it (or " Elohim " in case the collocation *Adhonai Yhwh* occurred) and the consonants of

Adhonai were often written in the margin of the manuscripts. When the vowel punctuation was added, the vowels of *Adhonai* were written in the text with the tetragrammaton, which thus appeared to read *Yehowah* (rarely *Yehowih*), or, according to an older system of transliteration, *Jehovah.* This form, with anglicized pronunciation, entered the English Bible and so came into general use in worship and theology as one of the names of God, connoting especially his majesty and greatness. For the derivation, meaning, etc., of the Hebrew form, see YAHWEH.

In Christian theology since the Reformation "Jehovah" has become an expression inclusive of the three persons of the Trinity. In the case of the Third Person this is rather tacit than explicit; in the case of the Second Person, the inclusion is explicit. Thus C. Hodge remarks: "This manifested Jehovah [i.e., the *Malakh Yahweh* or "Angel of Yahweh"], who led his people under the Old-Testament economy, is declared to be the Son of God, the λόγος, who was manifested in the flesh" (*Systematic Theology*, i. 485; cf. "Christ is represented . . . as the Jehovah of the Old Testament, who led the Israelites through the wilderness," p. 512). Similarly Shedd first identifies the *Malakh Yahweh* with Yahweh and then says: "The Jehovah in the theophany was the same trinitarian person who is in the incarnation" (*Dogmatic Theology*, i. 110, New York, 1888). To the same purport may be cited A. H. Strong (*Systematic Theology*, p. 146, New York, 1902), A. A. Hodge (*Popular Lectures on Theological Themes*, i. 263, Philadelphia, 1887), S. Harris (*God the Creator and Lord of All*, i. 315, New York, 1896), W. F. Gess (*Das Dogma von Christi Person und Werk*, pp. 244–246, Basel, 1887), and dogmaticians in general. Church covenants not infrequently use the term "Jehovah-Jesus" to emphasize the deity of Christ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: See literature under YAHWEH.

JEHU (Hebr. *Yehu;* Assyr. *Ya-u-a:* LXX. *Iou;* Josephus, *Ieous*): Tenth king of Israel, a usurper, successor of Joram, whom he slew. His dates, according to the old chronology, are 884–856 B.C.; according to Kamphausen, 843–815; according to Köhler, 881–853 B.C.; and according to Curtis (*DB*, i. 401), 842–815 B.C. The Books of Kings (I, xix. 16–17; II, ix.–x.) give a detailed account of the manner in which Jehu gained his throne, rooted out the house of Ahab, and exterminated the worship of Baal. The statement (II Kings x. 32–34) that during the reign of Jehu Hazael of Damascus took possession of the whole of the country east of the Jordan is to be understood of the whole of Bashan and Gilead. The rest of the recital, as well as I Kings xx. 22, and probably II Kings iii. 4–27, vi. 24–vii. 17 is derived from a special North-Israelitic source, both old and valuable.

Jehu was a leader in Joram's army and, during the battle with the Arameans at Ramoth-gilead, had the chief command. As one day he was taking council with his captains, a youth appeared, gave him a message from the prophet Elisha, anointed him king over Israel, and hastened away. Jehu then regarded himself as Yahweh's appointed instrument to execute justice upon the house of Ahab. He had the gates of the city guarded so that no news could reach Joram, and then hastened with a troop toward Jezreel. After two messengers despatched by Joram had been detained, Joram and his friend Ahaziah went to meet Jehu. In answer to the question whether he brought good news, he replied with the sinister remark that nothing could be good as long as the heathenish practises of Jezebel continued, and then sent an arrow through the heart of the fleeing Joram. Jehu ordered the dead body to be thrown into the neighboring field of Naboth, and then entered Jezreel. Jezebel, by his command, was hurled from the window at which she stood and mocked. The nobles, who felt no disposition to risk anything for the house of Ahab, submitted to Jehu, and he ordered them to appear before him the next day with the heads of the seventy princes who were in Samaria. He declared, hypocritically, that he was innocent of the death of the princes, which had been accomplished by the will of God in fulfilment of the words of Elisha, and then proceeded to slay all the relations of Ahab as well as his officials, friends and priests. Thereupon he advanced against Samaria. On his way thither, he slew forty-two princes of the house of David, who were on their way to Jezreel to visit their kindred (II Kings x. 12–14). Jehu openly sided with the party which would not tolerate the worship of Baal and proceeded to do all in his power to extirpate it.

All that is known of the subsequent twenty-eight years of Jehu's reign is that he fought unsuccessfully against the Arameans under Hazael (II Kings x. 32), who ascended the throne of Damascus about the same time as Jehu became king of Israel (II Kings viii. 7–15) and by the same means—regicide. The misfortune in this war with Syria is ascribed (II Kings x. 31) to Jehu's protection of the calf-worship in Israel, although the continuance of his dynasty for four generations is regarded as a reward for rooting out Baal-worship. W. LOTZ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The sources are I Kings xix. 16–17; II Kings ix.–x.; II Chron. xxii. 7–9. The literature is given under AHAB (q.v.). Consult also: C. F. Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of . . . Kings*, Oxford, 1903; *DB*, ii. 564–566; *EB*, ii. 2355–2357; *JE*, vii. 88–89.

JENKS, BENJAMIN: English clergyman and theological writer; b. at Eaton-under-Haywood (13 m. s. of Shrewsbury), Shropshire, May, 1646; d. at Harley (8 m. s.e. of Shrewsbury), Shropshire, May 10, 1724. Very little is known of his life. After his ordination he officiated for a time as curate at Harley, and subsequently became vicar of the parishes of Harley and Kenley, and also chaplain to Francis, Viscount Newport, the patron of these livings. He is remembered for his *Prayers and Offices of Devotion for Families, and for Particular Persons upon Most Occasions* (London, 1697; 2 vols., 1706; 26th ed. by C. Simeon, 1808; 13th ed. of Simeon's revision, 1866). Other works by Jenks are *Meditations, with Short Prayers Annexed, in Ten Decades* (London, 1701); *A Second Century of Meditations* (1704); and *The Poor Man's Ready Companion* (1713).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Gentleman's Magazine*, Dec., 1852; *DNB*, xxix. 315.

JENNINGS, ARTHUR CHARLES: Church of England; b. in London Dec. 19, 1847. He was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge (B.A., 1872), and was ordered deacon in 1873 and ordained priest in 1874. He was curate of St. Edward's, Cambridge (1873–74), and rector of Whittlesford, Cambridgeshire (1877–86). Since 1886 he has been rector of King's Stanley, Gloucestershire. Theologically he is a broad churchman. Besides contributing the commentary on Nahum, Haggai, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah to the fifth volume of C. J. Ellicott's *Old Testament Commentary* (London, 1884), was joint author of *Commentary on the Psalms* (2 vols., London, 1875–77); *Ecclesia Anglicana: A History of the Church of Christ in England . . . to the Present Times* (1882); *Synopsis of Ancient Chronology* (1886); *Manual of Church History* (2 vols., 1887–88; 3d ed., 1905); *Chronological Tables of the Events of Ancient History* (1888); and *Mediæval Church and the Papacy* (1909).

JEPHTHAH, jef′thū: The name of one of the Judges of Israel. It is related (Judges x. 6–xii. 7) that he was driven from his home because of illegitimate birth, and became captain of a band of freebooters in the land of Tob. When the Israelites of the East Jordanland were oppressed by the Ammonites, they sent for him to return and lead them against their enemies. This he consented to do if he were given the headship, which was promised him. After vainly trying by argument to induce the foe to retire, he made a vow to sacrifice whatever should come forth to meet him if he should return from the campaign victorious. He won a brilliant victory, and was met by his daughter on his return who consented to the performance of his vow, asking, however, a reprieve of two months. He performed the sacrifice, and a yearly celebration was established in which for four days the women lamented Jephthah's daughter. Jephthah was assailed by the Ephraimites for not summoning them to the battle, and in an ensuing conflict inflicted upon them a stinging defeat. He then ruled as judge for six years.

Discussion of the Sources.

Examination of the narrative shows that several sources are employed, and the story enclosed in the pragmatic framework is itself complex. Jephthah is mentioned as the son of Gilead by a foreign wife; but Gilead is the name of a district or of its population. Moreover, the section xi. 12–28 severs the continuity of the narrative and discusses the Moabites, whom the Hebrews had left unassailed (Num. xx. 14 sqq.), while xi. 34 shows that the hero had a house in Mizpah, which does not accord with verse 3. And it is difficult to relate the episode of the Ephraimitic conflict with the two months of the reprieve of Jephthah's daughter, since it is not likely that the Ephraimites would await the issue of that event. Many scholars have suspected an extension of the original text by interpolation, the passage xi. 12–28 especially being regarded as of late introduction, though this is opposed by Holzinger and Budde on the ground that the verses in which the Ammonites are mentioned (12–15, 27) show the same conception as the main portion of the narrative. It is probable, however, that this is an independent report which the redactor wished to bring into connection with the Ammonitic war. Wellhausen and Frankenberg suspect also xii. 1–7 as a late interpolation founded upon viii. 1–3. While the individuality of this section differentiates it from viii. 1–3, it is probably taken from an independent source. Holzinger disposes of one of the difficulties by supposing that Jephthah, on his recall from Tob, acquired a residence in Mizpah. That a war with Moab is implied in xi. 12–28 goes well with the place names in verse 33, some of which are Moabitic, while others are Ammonitic, and thus a double narrative is suggested dealing with two episodes, which an addition in verse 33 of the Septuagint, "and unto Arnon," supports. Then the Moabitic war was later, and the residence in Mizpah already acquired goes well with the "I" and "me" of verse 27. Holzinger finds in xi. 29 a suggestion of a journey made by Jephthah in the West Jordanland ("and Manasseh") connecting xi. with xii. 1–6, and concludes that there are two sources combined inside the framework of this story.

Historicity of the Narrative.

Against the historical character of the narrative of the Ammonitic war there is no reasonable objection. Jephthah appears as an exile who has gained position as head of a band like that of David. The differences of the two sources do not oppose the historicity, since the events may be referred to different times and occasions, a war with the Ammonites and one with Moabites. The hero is not to be taken as a mythical invention to explain the celebration of the death of his daughter, and analogies of the event are not lacking in the history of other Semitic peoples. One is furnished by the story of II Kings iii. 27, and another comes out of Arabic history of the seventh Christian century (Tabari, i. 1073–1074), so that the historical character of the event which the celebration commemorated appears at least probable. Since in the narrative there is no mention of substitution, it must be that Jephthah really sacrificed his daughter. This was the understanding of the early exegetes until D. Kimchi, who asserted that the maiden was simply devoted to the service of Yahweh, an explanation which gained the approval of later Christian exegetes, who combined the idea with that of an enforced celibacy. The reason for this is not far to seek, since not only is human sacrifice in itself unusual for such a state of society, but it was supposed that the Pentateuchal legislation was well known in the time of the Judges (cf. Lev. xviii. 21, xx. 2–5, and see Vows, I.; cf. also the Targum on Judges xi. 39); moreover emphasis was laid on the fact that the maiden bewailed not her life, but her virginity, as though condemned to a single life. Some support was gained from Ex. xxxviii. 8 and I Sam. ii. 22, though it is not said that the women mentioned here were celibates. But the true explanation of verse 37 doubtless is that the cause of the maiden's grief was that she must die without being either wife or mother. Some take refuge in a disjunctive in the statement of the vow (verse 31) making the last two clauses apply to different objects, human and animal. Other syntactical devices have been proposed with the object of getting rid of the sacrifice of a human being, but they all fail in view of the fact that the verb used in the passage (*heʿelah*) is that employed in the technical language of the ritual for sacrifice. Moreover, human sacrifice is involved in the whole story; only thus can be explained the despair of the father and the grief of the daughter; and the celebration itself finds no adequate ground short of the actual sacrifice of the maiden. In anti-prophetic circles human sacrifice was not unknown (Jer. xxxii. 35); indeed, within the prophetic circle itself the idea was not absolutely strange (Gen. xxii.). That the words of Jephthah's vow involve that he thought only of a human being and must therefore have reckoned upon the possibility of the victim being his daughter is rightly characterized by Reuss as "detestable." But the idea of human sacrifice lay in the background of the Yahweh-religion, and in later times under foreign influence the practise broke out in opposition to the prophetic teaching. (F. Buhl.)

Bibliography: The best discussion is in the Commentary on Judges by G. F. Moore, with which should be compared the treatment in the Commentaries of Studer, Keil, Cassel, Bertheau, Harvey, Oettli and Budde, as mentioned under Judges, and that in the standard works on the History of Israel, mentioned under Ahab. Consult further: E. W. Hengstenberg, *Einleitung in das A. T.*, iii. 127, Berlin, 1839, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1847–48; K. A. Auberlen, in *TSK*, 1860, pp. 540 sqq.; E. Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften A. T.*, Brunswick, 1874, Eng. transl., Boston, 1884; I. Goldziher, *Der Mythus bei den Hebräern*, pp. 113 sqq., Leipsic, 1876; A. Kuenen, *Historisch-kritisch Onderzoek*, i. 349, Leyden, 1885; J. Wellhausen, *Komposition des Hexateuchs*, pp. 228–229, Berlin, 1889; K. Budde, *Richter und Samuel*, pp. 125 sqq., Giessen, 1890; M. Köhler, *Biblische Geschichte des Alten Bundes*, ii. 1, p. 100; H. Schultz, *O. T. Theology.* London, 1892; W. Frankenberg, *Die Komposition des deuteronomischen Richterbuches*, Marburg, 1895; A. Kamphausen, *Das Verhältnis des Menschenopfers zur israelitischen Religion*, pp. 46 sqq., Bonn, 1896; E. Sellin, *Beiträge zur israelitischen und jüdischen Religion*, i. 200 sqq., Leipsic, 1896; *DB*, ii. 567–568; *EB*, ii. 2359–62; ***JE*, vii.** 94–95.

JEREMIAH, jer″e-mai′ā.

I. The Prophet.
  Family and Social Connections (§ 1).
  His Life and Times (§ 2).
  Literature Ascribed to Jeremiah (§ 3).
II. The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah.
1. The Contents.
  Chapters i.–x. (§ 1).
  Chapters xi.–xvii. (§ 2).
  Chapters xviii.–xxix. (§ 3).
  Chapters xxx.–lii. (§ 4).
2. The Composition.
  The Groundwork and its Expansion (§ 1).
  The Greek and the Hebrew Text (§ 2).
3. The Importance of the Book.
III. The Lamentations of Jeremiah.
  Names, Place in the Canon (§ 1).
  The Artistic Form (§ 2).
  Traditional View of Authorship (§ 3).
  Arguments Concerning Jeremianic Origin (§ 4).

I. The Prophet: The name (Hebr. *Yirmeyahu* or *Yirmeyah;* Gk. *Ieremias*) is borne not only by the prophet, but also by the father-in-law of King Josiah (II Kings xxiii. 31), by a Rechabite (Jer. xxxv. 3), by a priest of the time of Nehemiah (Neh. x. 3) and by persons in the Chronicler's tables (I Chron. v. 24, xii. 4, 10, 13). In spite of his importance the prophet is seldom mentioned in the Old Testament outside of his book (II Chron. xxxv. 25, xxxvi. 12, 21, 22; Ezra i. 1; Dan. ix. 2), which remains the principal and quite full source for knowledge of his life. According to this source Jeremiah was of priestly lineage from the little city of Anathoth, 3 m. north of Jerusalem (i. 1), a son of Hilkiah (i. 1), and nephew of Shallum (xxxii. 7). A possible relationship to Abiathar is suggested by I Kings ii. 26, but the identity of his father with the Hilkiah of II Kings xxii. is improbable. His known history begins in the thirteenth year of Josiah (626 B.C.), when he was called to the prophetic office (i. 6). His position regarding sacrifice (vii. 22) is against the supposition that he acted as a priest. Notwithstanding the hatred aroused among the people of Anathoth by his preaching, he exercised his rights there (xi. 21, xxxii. 8, xxxvii. 12), though his duties as prophet were performed at the capital. From xvi. 2 it seems probable that he was unmarried.

1. Family and Social Connections.

Jeremiah lived in critical times. Five years after his call the law book was found which caused the Josianic reformation, to which his words in chap. xi. apply. But little is known, however, of his work under Josiah, though of his activities under Jehoiakim (q.v.) more is told. Jehoiakim was not of a nature to respond to prophetic ideals, being a brutal despot wrapped up his building-projects (xxii. 13–19). The prophet denounced in his addresses the heathen and unethical influences protected by the princes, and at the time of the battle of Carchemish appeared with a prophetic program which aroused against him the bitterest hate. At the beginning of the king's reign an address in the court of the temple foretelling the fate of that structure incensed priests, prophets, and people (vii., xxvi.), and in 605 he gave definite form to this, pointing to the Chaldeans as the people into whose power Judah was to fall, and had Baruch commit it to writing. This was brought to the king, who tore it into pieces and threw it into the fire (xxxvi). The events of succeeding years proved the justification of Jeremiah, though they caused him, in his love for his people, the deepest suffering. Jehoiakim had become the vassal of the Chaldean king, but soon began to intrigue against him, relying on the power of Egypt, thus causing a Chaldean attack which was the beginning of the end, and his successor Jeconiah, with the best of the people, was carried away to Babylon (597 B.C.). The new king, Zedekiah, was not so hostile to Jeremiah, and indeed twice saved his life, in spite of the court party which wished to continue the policy of Jehoiakim. Jeremiah was opposed also by false prophets, who predicted speedy restoration of power, and reliance on Egypt was encouraged. After this, the final revolt broke out in the breach of Zedekiah's oath and Nebuchadrezzar's army came against Jerusalem. When Zedekiah applied for counsel to Jeremiah, the latter advised uncon-

2. His Life and Times.

ditional surrender to the Chaldeans. Temporary retirement of the Chaldeans filled the people with joy, which Jeremiah foretold would be short-lived, as events proved (xxxiv.). Meanwhile, as Jeremiah was going out of the city to visit Anathoth, he was arrested and thrown into prison, but removed by the king to another place of detention and by him supported there (xxxvii.). His opponents, who rightly feared his influence, besought the king to have him put to death, and to that end had him thrown into a foul cistern to die, whence he was again rescued by the king's order and placed in detention near the king (xxxviii.). At the capture of the city Jeremiah was taken prisoner, but was released by a Babylonian commander and given his choice between going to Babylonia and remaining in Judea, accepting the latter alternative. He gave his support to Gedaliah, the governor appointed by the Chaldeans. Gedaliah was soon after murdered, and the leaders of the people, in fear of the consequences, and following the advice of a prophet who opposed Jeremiah, fled with a number of the population to Egypt, taking with them both Jeremiah and Baruch. There the hostile relations between prophet and people continued because of his denunciations of their heathen proclivities and his prediction that Egypt should fall into the power of Nebuchadrezzar (xxxix.–xliv.). This closes the authentic record of the prophet's life. The Old Testament does not tell of his death. Tradition has it that he was stoned to death in Egypt (Tertullian, *Scorpiace*, viii.; *ANF*, iii. 640; II Macc. ii. gives a report of his hiding certain sacred utensils in a cave, on which is founded the *Paralipomena* of Jeremiah and the apocryphal Baruch literature with its sequellæ (see Apocrypha, A, IV., 5; Pseudepigrapha, Old Testament, II., 10–11, 35; and cf. Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 223 sqq., 285–286, Eng. transl. II., iii. 83–93; II Macc. xv. 11 sqq.; Matt. xvi. 14).

3. Literature Ascribed to Jeremiah.

It is reported in II Chron. xxxv. 25 that Jeremiah wrote a dirge on the death of Josiah, called Lamentations; this is probably the first trace of the tradition which ascribes to him the book of that name, which is, however, opposed by the contents of the book. A manuscript of the Septuagint ascribes Ps. lxv. and cxxxvii. to him, and there is an apocryphal Epistle of Jeremiah (see Apocrypha, A., IV., 6). A passage in the Book of Jeremiah is luminous for the history of that production (xxxvi. 2 sqq.). According to this, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim Jeremiah dictated to Baruch the prophecies which he had uttered in the twenty-three years of his prophetic activity. This being burned by the king, he had Baruch rewrite it with many additions (xxxvi. 32). This new book is not identical with the present book, since the latter contains prophecies of a later time; but that it formed the basis of our book may be confidently assumed, and it may be reconstructed by putting together the pieces which are older than Jehoiakim's fifth year.

II. The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah.—1. The Contents: Chap. i. states that the prophet is informed in the thirteenth year of Josiah before his birth that he had been called to predict the coming of powers from the north against his people, whose hate he was to incur.

1. Chapters i.-x.

But the indication in the chapter itself of the lapse of twenty years proves that the narrative depends upon the memory of the prophet and is not exactly contemporary with the utterance itself. It is clear that Jeremiah narrates the story of his earlier experiences in the light his later life had given him, and sharp distinction between later and earlier utterances is not possible. In ii.–vi. the parts are closely related to each other and belong to the same conditions in the reign of Josiah. These chapters bewail the people's sins, their idolatry, their fondness for covenants with foreign powers, and foretell coming judgment. Yet in this section passages suggest the time of Jehoiakim (v. 1, ii. 18, 36). Who the northern foe in these chapters is raises a difficult question. They are an ancient people, whose speech is unknown to Israel, carrying bow and spear and possessing chariots. Some of these marks appear when the prophet's utterances concern the Chaldeans in the time of Jehoiakim. Some scholars refer them to the Scythians, in which case Jeremiah must later have modified them, since their present form hardly fits references to that people. It is questionable therefore whether Jeremiah's earlier prophecies were not general; when the Chaldeans appeared on the scene he may have identified them with the foe foretold. While v. 18 and the related v. 10 are not un-Jeremianic, they do not fit their present place; similarly iii. 6–iv. 2 is hardly intelligible unless iii. 14–18 is taken out. It is probable that these passages are genuine, but transferred hither by an editor. Chapters vii.–x. contain a discourse delivered in the court of the temple, upon which structure the people put their trust. If they continue in their sins, the temple will be no help, but will perish as did the sanctuary at Shiloh. Its sacrifices are worthless, the people who bring them are untrue and have filled it with heathen symbols which represent their own unethical nature. Chaps. ix. 22–x. give the impression of fragmentariness, and, as the Septuagint shows, have been expanded, and suggest a deutero-Jeremiah. The little pieces ix. 22–23 and 24–25 have no connection with the previous context, while x. 17 sqq. appear to be genuine and the original continuation of ix. 21. Genuineness is apparent in vii. 1–ix. 21, but, contrary to Hitzig, Hävernick, and others, the passage appears to belong rather with xxvi. and to connect not with the time of Josiah, but with the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim, especially in the matter of heathen practises.

2. Chapters xi.-xvii.

In xi. 1–17 Jeremiah warns the people to regard "the words of this covenant." In spite of the punishment of their fathers, the present generation continues its service of other gods and renders divine punishment imminent. That the "covenant" is the law book found under Josiah is generally recognized; the passage can not, however, in its present form have been uttered then, but in the time of Jehoiakim, and so furnishes a good example of the way in which in the reduction of his words to writing Jeremiah mingled past and present. In xi.

18–xii. 6 the prophet deals with the hostility of his fellow villagers of Anathoth. Formally, by the "then" of xi. 18, it is connected with the preceding; but the exact relation expressed is not clear, and this suggests that the passage is not in its original context. Uncertain in date is xii. 7–17. It contains a lament for the desolation of the land and threats against the neighbors who have done the evil. It fits in well with the destruction suggested by II Kings xxiv. 2, but still better with conditions during the exile. Indeed, the lament seems to have been put together out of two diverse compositions of different age. The humiliation of Judah in Babylon is figuratively described in xiii., with a lament for the condition resulting. Most critics date the piece (by verses 18–19) in the time of Jeconiah (Jehoahaz), Graf in that of Jehoiakim, the latter regarding verses 18–19 as an addition out of Jeconiah's age. A terrible drought is the occasion of xiv.–xv., in which Jeremiah prays for his people—unavailingly, for even Moses and Samuel could not save them (xv. 1). At the close (xv. 10–21) Jeremiah bewails his personal sorrows caused by his foes. Whether this piece is in its original connection is uncertain, but it may be placed in the original book and dated at the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim. In xvi.–xvii. the prophet is forbidden to marry, or to participate in mourning or feasting; the destruction of the people is near, since its sins can not be forgotten and its punishment is certain. The connection of this with the preceding is quite certain, though probably xvii. 14–18 is inserted by a later hand from another place. The genuineness of xvii. 19–27 is, however, very doubtful.

3. Chapters xviii.-xxix.

In xviii. 1–10 the work of the potter pictures God's methods with man; judgment might be averted were it not for the people's wilful sin (11–17); the prophet bewails his people's hostility to him (18–23); as an earthen vessel is broken, so shall the people be (xix. 1–15); the prophet retorts upon Pashhur, who had put him in the stocks, with a prophecy of personal evil and general doom (xx. 1–6), and then bewails his own sad lot (7–18). The indications favor the time of Zedekiah, especially the mention of Pashhur and the imprisonment of Jeremiah in the stocks. Some have seen in chap. xvii. an earlier piece, and regard xix.–xx. as pieces edited by later hands and containing genuine experiences of the prophet. To the time of Zedekiah belongs xxi. 1–10, and to the time of the siege verses 4–5, but 11–14 has no connection with the preceding, and perhaps goes with xxii. The kings of Judah are dealt with in xxii. 1–xxiii. 8. A king, not identified, is warned to do justice in order to escape judgment (xxii. 1–5); in succeeding verses Shallum (i.e. Jehoahaz), Jehoiakim, and Jeconiah are dealt with; better shepherds are to be given (xxiii.1–4), and a new shoot is to spring from the Davidic stump (4–8). The principal part of this is of the time of Zedekiah, but xxii. 6–9, 20–23 are later insertions. The genuineness of xxiii. 1–4 has been questioned and is hard to prove, and the passage has been assigned to exilic times. A speech against false prophets is found in xxiii. 9–40. In xxiv. the exiles are compared with good figs, Zedekiah and the people remaining with bad ones. According to the superscription xxv. belongs to the fourth year of Jehoiakim, the year of the battle of Carchemish. In it Jeremiah foretells the desolation and captivity which are to come through Nebuchadrezzar, and then after seventy years God will again rule his people. The genuineness of this chapter has been sharply attacked (cf. verses 12–14), though Giesebrecht rightly sees a Jeremianic basis. The cipher in verse 26 (cf. R.V. margin) is not in Jeremiah's style. A report of the danger of death incurred by the prophet through the address in the temple court, given in chap. vii., is given in chap. xxvi. It does not belong to the groundwork or original basis of the book. According to xxvii.–xxix., ambassadors had come to Jerusalem from the neighboring states to urge common action against Babylon (xxvii.). A prophet Hananiah foretells the return of the exiles to Babylon within two years; Jeremiah retorts with a prediction of Hananiah's death within the year and a contradiction of his prophecy of a speedy return (xxviii.). A letter from Jeremiah to the exiles in Babylon is in xxix. These chapters appear to have existed at one time as a separate and independent section.

4. Chapters xxx.-lii.

A series of prophecies of comfort are continued in xxx.–xxxiii., and xxxii. rests on a personal relation of Jeremiah regarding the purchase of a field, which is made the basis of a prediction of return from exile. The chapter bears the marks of an editor, however, and verses 17–23 have been especially suspected, while xxxiii. 14–15 recall xxiii. 5–6, the genuineness of which is under a cloud. Even if the earlier passage is genuine, it does not seem likely that Jeremiah would so modify the representation as the later passage does. Smend denies xxx.–xxxi. to Jeremiah, and is possibly right as to xxx., though xxxi. seems to contain more of Jeremiah's work; possibly those two chapters are exilic. Chapter xxxiv. belongs to the narrative part of the book and is placed in the time of the siege of the city. The Rechabites appear in xxxv. as an example of faithfulness and as a lesson to Judah. The time is that of the passing of a Chaldean army through the land in the time of Jehoiakim, but the occasion can not be decided; it belongs to the narrative portion of the book, and Jeremiah speaks in the first person. Chapter xxxvi. is also narrative, and tells of the committal to writing of the predictions of the prophet. Similar narrative portions are xxxvii.–xliv.; xxxix. is an insert and an expansion of part of lii. Consolation is offered in xlv. A series of prophecies against foreign peoples is contained in xlvi.–li., the nations mentioned being Egypt, Philistia, Moab, Ammon, Edom, Damascus, Arabia, Elam, and Babylonia. Chapters l.–li., according to li. 59–64 imparted to Seraiah in the fourth year of Zedekiah, are by most modern critics regarded as un-Jeremianic. These chapters depend not only on secondary parts of Jeremiah, but on later parts of Isaiah. Some critics separate li. 59 sqq. from the rest as genuine; others regard the chapters as expanded statements of genuine oracles of Jeremiah. In general, the use of other predictions in these chapters and the departure from the accustomed forms of Jeremiah's usage seem to warrant suspicion. On the other hand, in the undoubted portions of the book there are prophecies against foreign nations, and in this portion Nebuchadrezzar is represented as the medium of divine punishment, which is a Jeremianic conception; moreover, the time noted in xlix. 34 looks genuine. Chapter lii. is not by Jeremiah, but is chiefly an excerpt from II Kings xxiv. 18–xxv. 30.

2. The Composition : The foregoing review shows that to the groundwork written in the fourth year of Jehoiakim and rewritten the next year belong i. 2–6, xi. 1–17, vii. 1–9, 21, xi. 18–xii. 6, xiii. (except verses 18–19), xiv.–xv., xvi.–xvii. (except some interpolations), xxv. (so far as it is original), and xlvi. 1–xlix. 33 (so far as they are Jeremianic), referring to the times of Josiah and Johoiakim. To the time of Zedekiah belong xxiv., xxi., xxiii. 9–40, and xlix. 34 sqq. (if genuine). Of the rest which may be ascribed to this prophet the time of writing is less evident, though xxxi., iii. 14–16, and perhaps the genuine parts of xxiii. 1–8, seem to belong to the time of the capture of Jerusalem. Larger parts which can not be certainly ascribed as a whole to Jeremiah are x. 1–16, xvii. 19–27, l.–lii. The narrative portions present a difficult problem, and the boundaries between them and the oracle portions are not always easy to fix. Some of these are in the first person, and were doubtless dictated to Baruch. Such pieces are xviii. (probably from the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign), xxxii. (under Zedekiah), and xxxv. (under Jehoiakim). Other pieces speak in the third person of "Jeremiah" or "the prophet Jeremiah," and can be only secondarily Jeremianic; such are xix.–xx., xxvi., xxvii.–xxix., xxxiv., xxxvi., xxxvii.–xliv. These rest on Baruch's authority, as does xlv., an oracle of consolation imparted to him by the prophet. So that in the Book of Jeremiah there are earlier and later pieces, passages in Jeremiah's words and those reported of him, and some not at all Jeremianic, bound up together in variegated fashion. Chronological order can not always be determined. The history of the book is not one that can at the present be made out. Certainly the composition of the fourth year of Jehoiakim lies at the basis, and this is expanded by later oracles and by narrative portions. The latter is in part no doubt from Baruch and contains reports of Jeremiah's discourses delivered to him by the prophet. The supposition that a life of the prophet has been interwoven into the book is improbable, since the earlier life of the prophet is not related. More likely is it that a literature of Jeremiah including his later speeches and narratives about him grew up, out of which our book is edited. Little dependence can be placed in i. 3, since that verse is probably only a secondary title.

1. The Groundwork and its Expansion.

To the foregoing considerations is to be added the fact that the Book of Jeremiah belongs to those portions of the Old Testament in which the Septuagint diverges essentially from the Massoretic text, a divergence which is very variously explained. Some esteem the Septuagint so highly that they speak of two recensions, a Palestinian and an Egyptian; while others speak of arbitrary changes by the translator. Both of these hypotheses have been shown unfounded (Kuenen, Giesebrecht, and others). While evidences of misunderstanding by the Greek translator and indeed of wilful change exist, there are passages where the text at the base of the Septuagint points to a text more original than the Massoretic. One such passage is that relating to the foreign nations, in which in the Greek xlvi.–li. follow xxv. 13, and the order of arrangement is different. The original connection of these parts is evident, though the entire section should not stand before xxvi. 15, and the Alexandrine order is less natural than the Massoretic. The difference in the length of the two texts, altogether apart from proofs of arbitrariness on the part of the translator, show that at the time of the translation the book had not yet reached a fixed form, a conclusion which is strengthened by observation of the evidence of inclusion of glosses.

2. The Greek and the Hebrew Text.

3. The Importance of the Book: This can not be appreciated if only the contents of the predictions are kept in mind. In this particular Jeremiah is not specially original, and particularly so if the purely Messianic passages, such as xxiii. 5–6, xxxiii. 15–16, are the basis of estimate, since these are lusterless in comparison with such passages as Isa. ix. 5–6, xi. 1–2. One might say in general that Jeremiah took over the prophecies of Amos and Hosea, being in his earlier deliverances especially dependent upon Hosea. For twenty years the prophet preached the insecurity of the basis of the people's hopes and trust. Even by the captivity of 597 the people were not awakened, but supposed that the deportation of Jeconiah was the excision of a worthless limb. For Jeremiah it was the fulfilment of prophecy which demanded submission and humility instead of new pride and the waking of hopes to be unrealized. The complete destruction of Jerusalem awaited persistence in the people's wilful course. Yet the prophet was not without hope in its truest sense. A new generation was to arise which was to bear Yahweh's law on the inner tablets of the heart, not on tablets of stone. In all this there was little that was not already existent in prophecy. Jeremiah's originality stands out in the vivid impression of his work as that of a prophet who was accounted a traitor to his people and a godless despiser of the sanctuary while he was yet the mouthpiece for the utterance of divine truths. It was this which made of him the greatest martyr among the prophets, and the evidence of it exists in his prayers written in his book, which give the clearest insight into the motive of his life. He bewails the hate with which the people pursued him who was that people's truest mediator with God, and reveals himself not merely as a prophet, but as a man living in the closest fellowship with God. In this respect he is creative and a pattern of religious sincerity, and thus he inspired the poets of the Psalm-book and the great poet of the Book of Job. The sense of the personal relation of the individual to God which appeared in later Judaism is a result of his work. In view of the importance of this service, the question of external form becomes a minor one. The disturbed conditions of his times did not minister to esthetic expression. The beauty of the book lies not in its poetic form, but in its deep and noble expression of the life of tenderness which it portrays. (F. Buhl.)

1. Names, Place in the Canon.

III. The Lamentations of Jeremiah: This is the name given by tradition to five elegies bearing a close resemblance to one another and bewailing the sad lot which befell Jerusalem and its inhabitants during and after the siege by the Chaldeans (587–586 B.C.). In Hebrew manuscripts and editions these elegies usually bear the title *ekhah*, "how," from the opening word of three of them; the Jews were, however, familiar with the designation *ḳinoth*, "lamentations" (Jerome, Preface to Lamentations, cf. *Baba Bathra*, 14b; LXX, *Thrēnoi;* Lat. *Threni* or *Lamentationes*). In the Greek version, which differs in character from that of the prophecies of Jeremiah, they are placed next to the prophecies (after Baruch), and are counted with the prophecies as one book. Only in this way could twenty-two canonical books be counted (Josephus, *Apion*, i. 8; Origen in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, vi. 25; Jerome in *Prologus galeatus*). Still the number twenty-four was common, in which computation Ruth and Lamentations were counted separately and placed among the Hagiographa. This arrangement differs from that followed by the Christians, which was the same as that of the Septuagint, but is in accord with that of the Talmud (*Baba Bathra* 14b), which places Lamentations among the *Kethubim*, where they probably stood from the time of the formation of the third division of the canon.

2. The Artistic Form.

In form the first four of these five elegies are characterized by an acrostic use of the alphabet. They are also composed in the rhythm which Budde has shown to be that of the lament or threnody. In chaps. i.–ii. a group of three lines in this meter (composed of a normal and a shortened member) is placed under each of the acrostic letters; the same is true in chap. iii., except that each of the three lines (in this case a verse) begins with the same letter, which, therefore, appears three times. In chap. iv., on the other hand, each acrostic letter includes two lines. No acrostic is found in chap. v., although the elegy consists of twenty-two verses presenting the usual parallelism, though the peculiar meter of the dirge is not very manifest. The five elegies refer to the same national misfortune and have many similarities in thought and form; yet each has its own peculiar quality. So chap. i. shows the sorrowing Zion, deserted and abandoned; chap. ii. describes the act of the angry God, the just enemy, who has destroyed the city; chap. iii. presents a more individual point of view; chap. iv. describes the sad fate of the populace of the city during and after the siege; chap. v. sketches briefly the resulting miserable state of the people. That the five songs were all produced under one inspiration is psychologically improbable; but in any event they did not arise without regard to one another. Style and language show many points of resemblance, and the historical situation is essentially the same in all. They can not have appeared during the siege itself; the misfortune is already complete, intense agony is already changing into a softer sadness, and feeling finds relief in seeking for a form of artistic expression.

3. Traditional View of Authorship.

Ancient tradition unanimously names Jeremiah as the author. The Preface to the Septuagint declares that "after the captivity of Israel, and the desolation of Jerusalem, Jeremiah sat down weeping and sang this lamentation over Jerusalem and said." This same tradition appears in the Talmud and is accepted by the Church Fathers. Jerome is indeed mistaken when (on Zech. xii. 11) he refers to Lamentations the statement in II Chron. xxxv. 25, where mention is made of elegies composed by Jeremiah on the death of Josiah. Perhaps he was misled by Lam. iv. 20. Josephus had already fallen into the same error. The Chronicler's notice shows that the prophet was accustomed to compose such elegies, and was naturally qualified to compose a *ḳina* on a grand scale, treating of the fall of Jerusalem, just as Ezekiel composed a series of such "threnodies" over other cities and peoples. Many passages in the Lamentations are in agreement with the thought and diction of the prophet; indeed, a prophetic note runs through these poems. The older authorities, almost without exception, hold the traditional view; only in modern times has the Jeremianic authorship been contested, and on grounds of importance. Thenius attributed only chaps. ii. and iv. to Jeremiah, Meier chaps. i.–iii.; others, for instance, Ewald, Nöldeke, Schrader, Nägelsbach, Löhr, Budde, entirely abandon Jeremianic authorship.

4. Arguments Concerning Jeremianic Origin.

The arguments against Jeremiah's authorship are partly formal and founded on esthetic grounds and partly refer to the contents of the poems and their theological quality. Nägelsbach (Commentary, p. xi. sqq.) and Löhr (*ZATW*, 1894) have noted statistically the agreements and differences in the vocabulary of Lamentations and of the prophecies of Jeremiah, and the probability appears to favor difference of authorship or a reediting of Jeremianic elegies. This probability is strengthened by linguistic similarities with the writings of Ezekiel. It was believed that an important distinction had been discovered between the writings of the prophet and these songs, in that these lacked the strong emphasis upon the sins of the people which would be expected from the prophet. Thus v. 7 is cited, according to which the unhappy generation suffered not so much for its own sins as for those of its forefathers (contrast Jer. xxxi. 29). That, in addition to inherited suffering, the measure has been filled up by the people's own faults and that thus a judgment has been called down upon them is a thought which runs through Lamentations also and finds particular expression in v. 16, 21. Budde finds that the consciousness of the guilt of the people is little developed in chaps. iv. and ii. (but cf. iv. 6). If Jeremiah was the author he does not here appear as God's advocate to bring an accusation against his people, but he gives free expression to natural sympathy, which he had suppressed until at last judgment was fully executed. Jeremiah loved his people and his rulers more than did the patriots, although a higher power had set him in opposition to them (Jer. i. 18). In this way iv. 20 must be explained, where the manner in which the king is spoken of might be thought strange as coming from Jeremiah, while iv. 17 offers no difficulties since he may well have voiced the timid hopes of the people in the last period of their trials, although these hopes were not shared by him. On the other hand, an unsolved difficulty for all who reject Jeremiah's authorship is offered by the unconditional condemnation of the prophets of Jerusalem (ii. 9, 14, iv. 13). Jeremiah might indeed have expressed himself in this way (cf. Jer. xiii. 13, xiv. 13 sqq., xxiii. 15); but if another had composed a lament over these events he could scarcely have forgotten the prophet who had won the highest reverence from the whole people through his sufferings. It was the general opinion that only Jeremiah's personal sufferings were described in chap. iii., and this seems most probable according to verse 8 (cf. Jer. vii. 16, xi. 14, xiv. 11). Verses 37–38 would then refer to those prophecies of misfortune with which he was reproached. Smend (*ZATW*, 1888, pp. 62–63) and many others suppose that in chap. iii. the poet speaks in the name of the community; in that case the very beginning, "I am the man," is exceedingly harsh and without analogy in this manner. The family of Shaphan (Gedaliah) has been especially considered in this connection (Löhr, *ZATW*, 1894, p. 55). As there is no mention of the rebuilding of Jerusalem and of the temple, and as dependence upon the second Isaiah can not be proved by a few lexical similarities, the exilic origin of Lamentations seems most reasonable. Whether these songs originated in Palestine, in Egypt, or in Babylonia is indeterminable, but it seems most probable that Jeremiah had a share in their production. This does not mean that they came from his hand in their present poetical form; the artificiality of form suggests the work of a school or of a group of disciples who, collecting and completing such threnodies, wove them together into the form in which they now appear.

C. VON ORELLI.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the life and times of Jeremiah consult: T. K. Cheyne, *Jeremiah, his Life and Times*, London, 1888; C. H. Cornill, *Jeremia und seine Zeit*, Heidelberg, 1880; K. Marti, *Der Prophet Jeremia*, Basel, 1889; M. Lazarus, *Der Prophet Jeremia*, Breslau, 1894; W. Erbt, *Jeremia und seine Zeit*, Göttingen, 1902; F. B. Meyer, *Jeremiah, Priest and Prophet*, London, 1902; J. R. Gillies, *Jeremiah; the Man and his Message*, ib. 1907; J. F. McCurdy, *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, vol. iii., New York, 1901.

Questions of criticism concerning the prophecies of Jeremiah are discussed in: G. C. Workman, *The Text of Jeremiah, or a Critical Examination of the Greek and the Hebrew with the Variations in the LXX*, Edinburgh, 1889; E. Kühl, *Das Verhältniss der Massora zur Septuagint im Jeremia*, Halle, 1882; E. Bruston, *De l'importance du livre de Jérémie dans la critique de l'A. T.*, Montauban, 1893; A. von Bulmerincq, *Das Zukunftsbild des Propheten Jeremia*, Riga, 1894; C. H. Cornill, in *SBOT*, 1895; idem, *Die metrischen Stücke des Buches Jeremia*, Leipsic, 1902; A. W. Streane, *The Double Text of Jeremiah*, London, 1896.

Commentaries which cover both the prophecies and Lamentations are by: B. Blayney, London, 1836; E. Henderson, Andover, 1868; H. Cowles, New York, 1869; C. W. E. Nägelsbach, in Lange's *Commentary*, New York, 1871; R. P. Smith, in *Bible Commentary*, London, 1875; A. W. Streane, in *Cambridge Bible*, Cambridge, 1881; T. K. Cheyne and others in the *Pulpit Commentary*, 2 vols., London, 1885–98.

Commentaries on the Prophecies are: S. R. Driver, London, 1896; W. Lowth, London, 1718; J. G. Dahler, 2 vols., Strasburg, 1825; W. Neumann, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1856–58; C. H. Graf, ib. 1862; F. Hitzig, ib. 1866; H. Ewald, Göttingen, 1868, Eng. transl., London, 1876; C. F. Keil, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1873–74; S. Scholz, Würzburg, 1880; L. A. Schneedorfer, Prague, 1881; C. von Orelli, 2d ed., Munich, 1905, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1889; C. F. Ball, in *Expositor's Bible*, London, 1890; F. Giesebrecht, Göttingen, 1894; W. H. Bennett, London, 1895; B. Duhm, Tübingen, 1901; G. Douglas, London, 1903; A. Ramsay, ib. 1905; A. Maclaren, ib. 1906.

Commentaries on Lamentations are: W. Engelhardt, Leipsic, 1867; E. Gerlach, Berlin, 1868; C. F. Keil, Leipsic, 1872; L. A. Schneedorfer, Prague, 1876; J. M. Schonfelder, Munich, 1887; S. Oettli, Nördlingen, 1889; M. Löhr, Göttingen, 1891, 1907; P. Mayriel, Montauban, 1894; C. Budde, Freiburg, 1898; J. P. Wiles, *Half-Hours with the Minor Prophets and Lamentations* (London, 1909). Consult also: *DB*, ii. 569–578; *EB*, ii. 2366–95; *JE*, vii. 96–107; and the works on O.-T. Theology, on Introduction to the O. T., on Prophecy in general, and on Messianic Prophecy.

JEREMIAS II., jer″e-mai′as: Patriarch of Constantinople; b. at Anchialos (now Ahiolo, 130 m. n.w. of Constantinople) about 1530; d. at Constantinople 1595. He received no systematic education in his youth. After officiating as metropolitan of Larissa, he was patriarch of Constantinople from 1572 to 1573 or 1579, from 1580 to 1584, and again from 1586 to 1595. In his efforts to reorganize the Greek Church he reenforced the existing laws and ordinances, and reached the climax of his endeavors in the synod held at Constantinople in 1593, which assailed simony, demanded a better education of the clergy, who were also required to preach frequently, took up the question of common schools, and reinstituted the "national synod." In his foreign relations Jeremias is noteworthy as the founder of the patriarchate of Russia, during a visit to that country in 1588–89, while he vigorously maintained the independence of the Greek Church against the Jesuits sent by Gregory XIII. to the East to win it over to the Roman Catholic Church. In the same spirit he refused to accept the Gregorian calendar, which was regarded by the Greeks as heretical.

Jeremias is particularly interesting on account of his correspondence with the Lutherans of Tübingen, the letters being contained in the *Acta et scripta theologorum Wirtembergensium et Patriarchae Constantinopolitani D. Hieremiae* (Wittenberg, 1584). Although the replies of the patriarch were not actually written by him, but by his pronotary, Theodosios Zygomalas, and are merely compilations from such Church Fathers as Basil and Chrysostom, and modern authors like Joseph Bryennios, Nikolaos Kabasilas, and Symeon of Thessalonica, they are important for an evaluation of the modern Greek Church, since they manifest genuine Greek orthodoxy and contain its first official verdict on Lutheranism, which they definitely rejected.

The history of the affair was as follows: In 1573 Stephen Gerlach went to Constantinople as preacher to the German ambassador with letters of recommendation to the patriarch from Jakob Andreä (q.v.), chancellor of the university at Tübingen, and Martin Crusius, the celebrated Hellenist and historian. The letters were well received; and the Tübingen professors were not slow to avail themselves of the opportunity of establishing communication between the Greek Church and the Lutherans, especially as Gerlach had become a personal friend of Zygomalas. They accordingly sent a second letter, dated Sept. 15, 1574, together with a Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession, and a third letter, dated Mar. 20, 1575, with a Greek translation of two sermons by Andreä and a request for an opinion concerning the Lutheran creed. The patriarch's answer, dated May 15, 1576, consisted of an elaborate treatise, in which he praised the articles on the church, the ecclesiastical office, the marriage of priests, and eschatology, but censured the introduction of "*filioque*" in the creed, and the depreciation of good works. He also insisted on seven virtues, vices, and sacraments, trine immersion, monastic vows, and the invocation of the saints at the consecration of the elements. The treatise, however, induced the Tübingen theologians to give a systematic defense of the principles on which their confession rested, and a new letter was sent, dated June 18, 1577, but it took two years before the patriarch's answer arrived (May, 1579), and it read more like a rebuke than an answer. Nevertheless, the Lutherans determined to try once more, and in the spring of 1580 sent a defense to Constantinople, but the patriarch's answer of June 6, 1581, was curt and final, and the Protestants were obliged to close the correspondence.

(Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: P. Meyer, *Die theologische Litteratur der griechischen Kirche im 16. Jahrhundert*, Leipsic, 1899; Hefele, in *TQS*, 1843, p. 544; P. Kerameus, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 1899, pp. 392 sqq.

JEREMIAS, yê″re-mî′ās, **ALFRED:** German Lutheran; b. at Markersdorf (a village near Chemnitz), Saxony, Feb. 21, 1864. He was educated at the University of Leipsic (Ph.D., 1886); was a teacher at a high school for girls in Dresden from 1887 to 1890, and deacon at the Lutherkirche, Leipsic, from 1890 to 1901. Since 1901 he has been pastor of the Lutherkirche, and since 1905 privat-docent for the history of religion and Old Testament in the University of Leipsic. In theology he is a believer in revealed religion. He has written *Die Höllenfahrt der Istar, eine altbabylonische Beschwörungslegende* (Munich, 1886); *Babylonisch-assyrische Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode unter Berücksichtigung der alttestamentlichen Parallelen* (Leipsic, 1886); *Izdubar Nimrod, eine altbabylonische Heldensage nach den Keilschriftfragmenten dargestellt* (1891); *Im Kampfe um Babel und Bibel* (1903); *Monotheistische Strömungen innerhalb der babylonischen Religion* (1904); *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients* (1904); *Babylonisches im Neuen Testament* (1905); and *Die Panbabylonisten. Der alte Orient und die ägyptische Religion* (1907).

JERICHO. See Judea, II., 2, § 1.

JEROBOAM, jer″o-bō′ɑm: The name of two kings of Israel.

1. Jeroboam I.: First king of Israel, son of Nebat and Zeruah, an Ephraimite of Zereda (Zaretan and Zartanah; Gk. *Sareira* or *Sarida*) north of Jericho and not far from Beth Shean (Josh. iii. 16; I Kings iv. 12). His dates, according to the old chronology, are 975–958 B.C.; according to Riehm, 938–917 B.C.; according to Cooke (*DB*, ii. 582) 937–915 B.C. According to the narrative in I Kings xi. 26 sqq., he was a servant of Solomon who, on account of his industry, was raised to a place of command in the region which he afterward ruled. On one occasion, when leaving Jerusalem, he was met by the prophet Ahijah from Shiloh, who rent his own (not Jeroboam's, as Ewald has it) mantle into twelve pieces and gave ten of them to Jeroboam as a sign that he was to rule over ten tribes, while one tribe was to remain under the Davidic dynasty. The Deuteronomic editor gives as the reason for this division of the kingdom the idolatry of Solomon; but there were probably also political and religious motives, among the former the old jealousy of the northern tribes and among the latter a prophetic interest (Ahijah was a Shilonite). Solomon heard of the incident and Jeroboam was forced to flee to Egypt, where he remained under Shishak till Solomon's death.

In I Kings xii. 3 (probably a later report) Jeroboam appears as spokesman for Israel at the gathering at Shechem to make Rehoboam king; but verse 20 makes it appear that Jeroboam was made king immediately on his return from Egypt. Rehoboam's intention to subject the revolted tribes by force of arms was overruled by the prophet Shemaiah on the ground that the division was of divine provision. Probabilities are against the representation of a long war between Jeroboam and Rehoboam (I Kings xiv. 30, xv. 6; II Chron. xiii. 2 sqq.); but it is not unlikely that an alliance was formed between Abijam and Damascus, renewing that which had been broken under Solomon (I Kings xi. 24).

Important measures of Jeroboam were the fortification of Shechem and the selection of it as his capital, and the fortification of Penuel to secure his eastern possessions. Tirzah, often a residence of the kings of Israel until the time of Omri, was also a place of note in his time (I Kings xiv. 17). Of supreme importance was Jeroboam's measure in sanctioning the cult of Bethel and of Dan to remove the necessity of going to Jerusalem to worship. This was probably only the legitimating of existing worship, and was not intended to be a rejection of the Yahweh cult (see Calf, The Golden, and Calf Worship). The later (Judaic) reports make Jeroboam create priests of the lower classes of the populace, the Levites being deposed. The festival established by Jeroboam is regarded by the narrator as intended to replace the Feast of Tabernacles (I Kings xii. 32). Of the narratives in I Kings xiii.–xiv. that in chap. xiii. is a midrash upon II Kings xxiii. 17 sqq.; that in chap. xiv. has made use of an earlier source, and is in Deuteronomistic spirit.

2. Jeroboam II.: Thirteenth king of Israel, son and successor of Joash. His dates according to the old chronology are 825–784 B.C.; according to Curtis (*DB*, i. 401) 782–741 B.C., according to Cooke (*DB*,

ii. 583) 790–749 B.C.; Jeroboam II. was one of the most important and powerful kings of the northern kingdom, his rule extending " from Hamath to the sea of the plain " (II Kings xiv. 23–29), probably including Moab under his power. According to Schrader (*KAT*, pp. 212 sqq.) his extraordinary success is to be explained from his relations with Assyria. Ramman-nirari III. of Assyria had overthrown Mari of Damascus, and in his inscription he claims to have laid the land of Omri (i.e., Israel) under tribute. It is not improbable that the conquered Damascus and its territory was turned over to Jeroboam in return for tribute. Commentators are at variance over the meaning of the reference in Hos. x. 14, " as Shalman spoiled Beth-arbel," whether it refers to a conquest of the Galilean city under Shalmaneser III. or IV., or to a calamity experienced by the Moabite King Salamanu mentioned by Tiglath-Pileser. II Kings xiv. 25 regards the success of Jeroboam as the fulfilment of the prophecy of Jonah the son of Amittai; but the prophecies of Hosea and Amos give a far different impression of the state of his kingdom, which under the external glory carried the seeds of decay, speedily to bear fruit. (E. KAUTZSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: 1. The sources are: I Kings xi. 26–40, xii. 1–xiv. 20; II Chron. x. 2–19, xi. 14–16, xii. 15, xiii. 2. Sources are: II Kings xiv. 23–29, xv. 1, 8; and especially the books of Amos and Hosea. For literature on both kings see the pertinent sections in the works cited under AHAB; ISRAEL, HISTORY OF.

JEROME.

- I. Life,
  - Studies and Travels to 378 (§ 1).
  - Sojourn in Rome, 382–385 (§ 2).
  - Residence in Palestine after 385 (§ 3).
- II. Works.
  - Biblical and Exegetical (§ 1).
  - Historical (§ 2).
  - Dogmatic and Polemical (§ 3).
  - Letters (§ 4).
- III. Theological Position.
  - His Excellences and Defects (§ 1).
  - His Lack of Independence (§ 2).

I. Life: **1. Studies and Travels to 378.** The famous ecclesiastical author commonly known as St. Jerome, whose full name was Eusebius Sophronius Hieronymus, was born at Stridon, on the border between Pannonia and Dalmatia, in the second quarter of the fourth century; d. near Bethlehem Sept. 30, 420. He came of Christian parents, but was not baptized until about 360, when he had gone to Rome with his friend Bonosus to pursue his rhetorical and philosophic studies. These were principally secular, probably including Greek literature; he seems as yet to have had no thought of studying the Greek Fathers, or any Christian writings. His journey with Bonosus to Gaul seems to have followed immediately upon a stay of several years in Rome. During this sojourn in eastern Gaul and " on the semi-barbarous banks of the Rhine," he seems to have been occupied with theological studies, and to have copied for his friend Rufinus Hilary's commentary on the Psalms and treatise *De synodis*. Next came a stay of at least several months, possibly years, with Rufinus at Aquileia, where he made many Christian friends. Some of these accompanied him when he set out about 373 on a journey through Thrace and Asia Minor into northern Syria. At Antioch, where he made the longest stay, two of his companions died and he himself was seriously ill more than once. During one of these illnesses (about the winter of 373–374) he had a vision which determined him to lay aside his secular studies and devote himself to the things of God. In any case he seems to have abstained for a considerable time from the study of the classics and to have plunged deeply into that of Holy Scripture, under the impulsion of Apollinaris of Laodicea, then teaching in Antioch and not yet suspected of heresy. Seized with the desire for a life of ascetic penance, he went for a time to the desert of Chalcis, to the southwest of Antioch, known as the Syrian Thebaid, from the number of hermits inhabiting it. During this period, however, he seems to have found time for study and writing. He made his first attempt to learn Hebrew under the guidance of a converted Jew; and at this time he seems to have been in relation with the Jewish Christians in Antioch, and perhaps as early as this to have interested himself in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, asserted by them to be the source of the canonical Matthew.

2. Sojourn in Rome, 382-385. Returning to Antioch, in 378 or 379, he was ordained by Bishop Paulinus, apparently with some unwillingness and on condition that he still continue his ascetic life. Soon afterward he went to Constantinople to pursue his study of Scripture under the instruction of Gregory Nazianzen. There he seems to have spent two years; the next three (382–385) he was in Rome again, in close intercourse with Pope Damasus and the leading Roman Christians. Invited thither originally to the synod of 382, held for the purpose of ending the schism of Antioch, he made himself indispensable to the pope, and took a prominent place in his councils. Among other duties he undertook the revision of the text of the Latin Bible on the basis of the Greek New Testament and the Septuagint, in order to put an end to the marked divergences in the current western texts (see BIBLE VERSIONS, A, II., 2). This commission determined the course of his scholarly activity for many years, and gave occasion to his most important achievement. He undoubtedly exercised an important influence during these three years, to which, outside of his unusual learning, his zeal for ascetic strictness and the realization of the monastic ideal contributed not a little. He was surrounded by a circle of well-born and well-educated women, including some from the noblest patrician families, such as the widows Marcella and Paula (qq.v.) with their daughters Blaesilla and Eustochium. The resulting inclination of these women for the monastic life, and his unsparing criticism of the life of the secular clergy, raised a growing hostility against him, especially in the class just named. Soon after the death of his patron, Damasus (Dec. 10, 384), he decided to retire from a position which was fast becoming impossible.

In August, 385, he returned to Antioch, accompanied by his brother Paulinianus and several friends, and followed a little later by Paula and Eustochium, who had resolved to leave their patrician surroundings and to end their days in the Holy Land. In the winter of 385 Jerome accom-

3. Residence in Palestine after 385.

panied them and acted as their spiritual adviser. The pilgrims, joined by Bishop Paulinus of Antioch, visited Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and the holy places of Galilee, and then went to Egypt, the home of the great heroes of the ascetic life. In Alexandria Jerome listened to the blind catechist Didymus expounding the prophet Hosea and telling his reminiscences of the great Anthony, who had died thirty years before; he spent some time in Nitria, admiring the disciplined community life of the numerous inhabitants of that "city of the Lord," but detecting even there "concealed serpents," i.e., the poison of Origenistic heresy. Late in the summer of 386 he was back in Palestine, and settled down for the remainder of his life in a hermit's cell near Bethlehem, surrounded by a few friends, both men and women (including Paula and Eustochium), to whom he acted as priestly guide and teacher. Amply provided by Paula with the means of livelihood and of increasing his collection of books, he led a life of incessant activity in literary production. To these last thirty-four years of his career belong the most important of his works—his version of the Old Testament from the original text, the best of his scriptural commentaries, his catalogue of Christian authors, and the dialogue against the Pelagians, the literary perfection of which even a controversial opponent recognized. To this period also belong the majority of his passionate polemics, which distinguished him among the orthodox Fathers, including notably the treatises occasioned by the Origenistic controversy against Bishop John of Jerusalem and his early friend Rufinus. As a result of his onslaughts on the Pelagians, he was subjected to actual persecution at their hands about the beginning of 416, when a body of excited partizans broke into the monastic buildings, set them on fire, and laid violent hands on the inmates, killing a deacon, and forcing Jerome to seek safety in a neighboring fortress. The date of his death is given by the *Chronicon* of Prosper. His remains, originally buried at Bethlehem, are said to have been later translated to the church of Santa Maria Maggiore at Rome, though other places in the West claim some relics—the cathedral at Nepi boasting the possession of his head, which, according to another tradition, is in the Escurial.

1. Biblical and Exegetical.

II. Works: The writings of Jerome cover nearly all the principal departments of Christian theology; but the most numerous and important belong to that of Biblical study, including especially his labors for the improvement or translation of the Latin text. His knowledge of Hebrew, primarily required for this branch of his work, gives also to his exegetical treatises (especially to those written after 386) a value greater than that of most patristic commentaries, although he is as a rule too much hampered by Jewish tradition, and indulges too often in allegorical and mystical subtleties after the manner of Philo and the Alexandrian school. But he deserves credit for the distinctness with which he emphasizes the difference between the Old-Testament Apocrypha and the *Hebraica veritas* of the canonical books (cf. especially his introductions to the Books of Samuel, see Prologus Galeatus, to the Solomonic writings, to Tobit, and to Judith. His exegetical works fall into three groups: (a) his translations or recastings of Greek predecessors, including fourteen homilies on Jeremiah and the same number on Ezekiel by Origen (translated c. 380 in Constantinople); two homilies of Origen on the Song of Solomon (in Rome, c. 383); and thirty-nine on Luke (c. 389, in Bethlehem). The nine homilies of Origen on Isaiah included among his works were not done by him. Here should be mentioned, as an important contribution to the topography of Palestine, his book *De situ et nominibus locorum Hebraeorum*, a translation with additions and some regrettable omissions of the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius. To the same period (c. 390) belongs the *Liber interpretationis nominum Hebraicorum*, based on a work supposed to go back to Philo and expanded by Origen. (b) Original commentaries on the Old Testament. To the period before his settlement at Bethlehem and the following five years belong a series of short Old-Testament studies—*De seraphim, De voce Osanna, De tribus quaestionibus veteris legis* (usually included among the letters as xviii., xx., xxxvi.); *Quaestiones hebraicae in Genesin; Commentarius in Ecclesiasten; Tractatus septem in Psalmos x.–xvi.* (lost); *Explanationes in Michaeam, Sophoniam, Nahum, Habacuc, Aggaeum.* About 395 he composed a series of longer commentaries, though in rather a desultory fashion—first on the remaining seven minor prophets, then on Isaiah (c. 395–c. 400), on Daniel (c. 407), on Ezekiel (between 410 and 415), and on Jeremiah (after 415, left unfinished). (c) New-Testament commentaries. These include only Philemon, Galatians, Ephesians, and Titus (hastily composed 387–388); Matthew (dictated in a fortnight, 398); Mark, selected passages in Luke, the prologue of John, and Revelation. Treating the last-named book in his cursory fashion, he made use of an excerpt from the commentary of the North-African Tichonius, which is preserved as a sort of argument at the beginning of the more extended work of the Spanish presbyter Beatus of Libana. But before this he had already devoted to the Apocalypse another treatment, a rather arbitrary recasting of the commentary of Victorinus (d. 303), with whose chiliastic views he was not in accord, substituting for the chiliastic conclusion a spiritualizing exposition of his own, supplying an introduction, and making certain changes in the text.

2. Historical.

One of Jerome's earliest attempts in the department of history was his *Temporum liber*, composed c. 380 in Constantinople; this is a recasting in Latin of the chronological tables which compose the second part of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, with a supplement covering the period from 325 to 379. In spite of numerous errors taken over from Eusebius, and some of his own, Jerome produced a valuable work, if only for the impulse which it gave to such later chroniclers as Prosper, Cassiodorus, and Victor of Tannuna to continue his annals. Three other works of a hagiological nature are the *Vita Pauli monachi*, written during his first sojourn at

Antioch (c. 376), the legendary material of which is derived from Egyptian monastic tradition; the *Vita Malchi monachi captivi* (c. 391), probably based on an earlier work, although it purports to be derived from the oral communications of the aged ascetic Malchus originally made to him in the desert of Chalcis; and the *Vita Hilarionis*, of the same date, containing more trustworthy historical matter than the other two, and based partly on the biography of Epiphanius and partly on oral tradition. The so-called *Martyrologium sancti Hieronymi* is spurious; it was apparently composed by a western monk toward the end of the sixth or beginning of the seventh century, with reference to an expression of Jerome's in the opening chapter of the *Vita Malchi*, where he speaks of intending to write a history of the saints and martyrs from the apostolic times. But the most important of Jerome's historical works is the book *De viris illustribus*, written at Bethlehem in 392, the title and arrangement of which are borrowed from Suetonius. It contains short biographical and literary notes on 135 Christian authors, from St. Peter down to Jerome himself. For the first seventy-eight Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, i.–viii.) is the main source; in the second section, beginning with Arnobius and Lactantius, he includes a good deal of independent information, especially as to western writers.

3. Dogmatic and Polemical.

Practically all of Jerome's productions in the field of dogma have a more or less violently polemical character, and are directed against assailants of the orthodox doctrines. Even the translation of the treatise of Didymus on the Holy Spirit into Latin (begun in Rome 384, completed at Bethlehem) shows an apologetic tendency against the Arians and Pneumatomachi. The same is true of his version of Origen's *De principiis* (c. 399), intended to supersede the inaccurate translation by Rufinus. The more strictly polemical writings cover every period of his life. During the sojourns at Antioch and Constantinople he was mainly occupied with the Arian controversy, and especially with the schisms centering around Meletius and Lucifer. Two letters to Pope Damasus (xv. and xvi.) complain of the conduct of both parties at Antioch, the Meletians and Paulinians, who had tried to draw him into their controversy over the application of the terms *ousia* and *hypostasis* to the trinity. At the same time or a little later (379) he composed his *Liber contra Luciferianos*, in which he cleverly uses the dialogue form to combat the tenets of that faction, particularly their rejection of baptism by heretics. In Rome (c. 383) he wrote a passionate counterblast against the teaching of Helvidius, in defense of the doctrine of the perpetual virginity of Mary, and of the superiority of the single over the married state. An opponent of a somewhat similar nature was Jovinianus, with whom he came into conflict in 392 (*Adversus Jovinianum*, and the defense of this work addressed to his friend Pammachius, numbered xlviii. in the letters). Once more he defended the ordinary catholic practises of piety and his own ascetic ethics in 406 against the Spanish presbyter Vigilantius, who opposed the cultus of martyrs and relics, the vow of poverty, and clerical celibacy. Meanwhile the controversy with John of Jerusalem and Rufinus concerning the orthodoxy of Origen occurred. To this period belong some of his most passionate and most comprehensive polemical works —the *Contra Joannem Hierosolymitanum* (398 or 399); the two closely-connected *Apologiae contra Rufinum* (402); and the " last word " written a few months later, the *Liber tertius seu ultima responsio adversus scripta Rufini.* For further details see ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSIES. The last of his polemical works is the skilfully-composed *Dialogus contra Pelagianos* (415).

4. Letters.

Jerome's letters, both by the great variety of their subjects and by their qualities of style, form the most interesting portion of his literary remains. Whether he is discussing problems of scholarship, or reasoning on cases of conscience, comforting the afflicted, or saying pleasant things to his friends, scourging the vices and corruptions of the time, exhorting to the ascetic life and renunciation of the world, or breaking a lance with his theological opponents, he gives a vivid picture not only of his own mind, but of the age and its peculiar characteristics. The letters most frequently reprinted or referred to are of a hortatory nature, such as xiv., *Ad Heliodorum de laude vitae solitariae;* xxii., *Ad Eustochium de custodia virginitatis;* lii., *Ad Nepotianum de vita clericorum et monachorum*, a sort of epitome of pastoral theology from the ascetic standpoint; liii., *Ad Paulinum de studio scripturarum;* lvii., to the same, *De institutione monachi;* lxx., *Ad Magnum de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis;* and cvii., *Ad Laetam de institutione filiae.*

III. Theological Position: Jerome undoubtedly ranks as the most learned of the western Fathers.

1. His Excellences and Defects.

He surpasses the others especially in his knowledge of Hebrew, gained by hard study, and not unskilfully used. It is true that he was perfectly conscious of his advantages, and not entirely free from the temptation to despise or belittle his literary rivals, especially Ambrose. His own scholarship is by no means without its weak points. His acquaintance with Greek and Latin literature, both pagan and Christian, is great, but by no means without its gaps and its traces of superficial reading; and his knowledge of Hebrew offers innumerable points of attack to modern criticism. As a general rule it is not so much by absolute knowledge that he shines as by an almost poetical elegance, an incisive wit, a singular skill in adapting recognized or proverbial phrases to his purpose, and a successful aiming at rhetorical effect. His weaknesses are most noticeable in dogmatic subjects. He was so little of a dogmatic theologian that he contributed only indirectly to the development of doctrine. The same may be said of his contribution to moral theology, in which he showed less an interest in abstract ethical speculation than a morbid ascetic zeal and passionate enthusiasm for the monastic ideal.

It was this attitude that made Luther judge him so severely. In fact, Evangelical readers are generally little inclined to accept his writings as authori-

2. His Lack of Independence.

tative, especially in consideration of his lack of independence as a dogmatic teacher and his submission to orthodox tradition. He approaches his papal patron Damasus with the most utter submissiveness, making no attempt at an independent decision of his own. The Church founded upon the rock of Peter is to decide whether he is to recognize, with the Meletians, three *hypostases* in the divine *ousia*, or, with the Paulinians, one *hypostasis* with three *prosōpa* or persons. "Decide, I pray thee, and I shall not fear to speak of three *hypostases*." He may be called not only the forerunner of modern ultramontanism, but even of the Jesuit unreasoning obedience. The tendency to recognize a superior comes out scarcely less significantly in his correspondence with Augustine (cf. the letters numbered lvi., lxvii., cii.–cv., cx.–cxii., cxv.–cxvi. in his own, and xxviii., xxxix., xl., lxvii.–lxviii., lxxi.–lxxv., lxxxi.–lxxxii. in Augustine's).

Yet in spite of the defects and weaknesses already mentioned, Jerome has retained a rank among the western Fathers. This would be his due, if for nothing else, on account of the incalculable influence exercised by his Latin version of the Bible upon the subsequent ecclesiastical and theological development. But that he won his way to the title of a saint and doctor of the catholic Church was possible only because he broke away entirely from the theological school in which he was brought up, that of the Origenists. In the artistic tradition of the Roman Catholic Church it has been usual to represent him, the patron of theological learning, as a cardinal, by the side of the Bishop Augustine, the Archbishop Ambrose, and the Pope Gregory. Even when he is depicted as a half-clad anchorite, with cross, skull, and Bible for the only furniture of his cell, the red hat or some other indication of his rank is as a rule introduced somewhere in the picture. (O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: The article in W. Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, ii. 459 sqq., London, 1890, is valuable as a bird's-eye view of Jerome's works, particularly in giving a table showing the numbers of the letters as they appear in the three principal arrangements. A valuable bibliography is given in Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 595–596, 1370–71; another is in the *British Museum Catalogue* and *Supplement;* still another in U. Chevalier, *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge*, pp. 1263–1265, Paris, 1894 sqq.

The edition of the "Works" by Erasmus, including all then known, appeared, 9 vols., Basel, 1516–20, followed by that of Marianus Victorinus, 9 vols., Rome, 1565–72; then came editions by U. Calixtus and A. Tribbechovius 12 vols., Frankfort, 1684–90, the Benedictine by J. Mertianay, 5 vols., Paris, 1693–1706; the edition of Vallarsi, 11 vols., Verona, 1734–42, reproduced in most subsequent editions, including that of *MPL*, xxii.–xxx. *NPNF*, 2d ser., vol. v. contains Eng. transl. of many of the 150 Letters, the Prefaces to his works, and a number of treatises, including his "Life of Hilarion," "Dialogue against Jovinianus" and "Dialogue against the Pelagians," with a valuable *Introduction* and *Life*.

The best sources for a life are his own writings, particularly his Letters and Prefaces, the latter of which often give a clear insight into his mental states as well as a knowledge of external events in his life. Augustine refers to him in *Epist.* 261, *Ad Oceanum, Contra Julianum I.*, and "City of God," xviii. 42; Sulpicius Severus records his impression, received during a stay with Jerome at Bethlehem lasting six months, in his *Dialogi*, i. 7–9. Elaborate modern treatments of the life are O. Zöckler, *Hieronymus, sein Leben und Wirken*, Gotha, 1865, and A. Thierry, *S. Jérôme, la société chrétienne à Rome et l'émigration romaine en terre sainte*, 2 vols., Paris, 1875. Consult farther: F. C. Collombet, *Hist. de S. Jérôme: sa vie, ses écrits, et sa doctrine*, 2 vols., Paris, 1844; W. S. Gilly, *Vigilantius and his Times*, pp. 91–124, London, 1844; C. F. de T. Montalembert, *Les Moines d'occident*, i. 144–187, Paris, 1861; E. Bernard, *Les Voyages de S. Jérôme*, ib. 1864; E. L. Cutts, *St. Jerome*, in *Fathers for English Readers*, London, 1878; A. P. F. de Lambel, *S. Jérôme*, Tours, 1880; C. Martin, *Life of St. Jerome*, London, 1888; F. W. Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers*, ii. 150–297, New York, 1889; P. Largent, *S. Jérôme*, Paris, 1898, Eng. transl., London, 1900; G. Grützmacher, *Hieronymus*, 3 vols., Leipsic, 1901–08; J. Brochet, *S. Jérôme et ses ennemis*, Paris, 1906; J. Turmel, *Saint Jérôme*, ib. 1906; Jose de Seguënza (Father Fray), *Life of St. Jerome*, London, 1907; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. xii.; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, vii. 545–711 et passim (other volumes contain much useful matter, consult Index); Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 205–214, 967–988, and in general, the church histories dealing with the period; *DB*, iv. 873–874; *DCB*, iii. 29–50.

Volumes dealing with special phases of Jerome's activity are: M. Rahmer, *Die hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken des Hieronymus*, Breslau, 1861; Aemil. Lübeck, *Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit*, Leipsic, 1872; A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters*, i. 176–203, ib. 1874; W. Nowack, *Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus für die alttestamentliche Textkritik*, Göttingen, 1875; H. Goelzer, *Étude lexicographique et grammaticale de la latinité de S. Jérôme*, Paris, 1884; A. Röhricht, *Essai sur S. Jérôme, exégète*, ib. 1891.

JEROME OF PRAGUE: One of the chief followers and most devoted friends of John Huss; b. at Prague about 1379; burned at the stake at Constance May 30, 1416. His family were well-to-do, and, as he was desirous of seeing the world, after taking his bachelor's degree at the University of Prague in 1398 he secured in 1399 permission to travel. In 1401 he returned to Prague, but in 1402 visited England, and at Oxford copied out the *Dialogus* and *Trialogus* of Wyclif, and thus evinced his interest in the great Oxford doctor. He also became an ardent and outspoken advocate of realism, and ever afterward Wyclifism and realism were charges which were constantly getting him into trouble. In 1403 he was in the Holy Land, in 1405 in Paris. There he took his master's degree, but Gerson drove him out. In 1406 he took the same degree in the University of Cologne, and a little later in that of Heidelberg. Nor was he any safer in Prague, to which he returned, and where, in 1407, he took the same degree. In that year he returned to Oxford, but was again compelled to flee. During 1408 and 1409 he was in Prague, and there his pronounced Czech preferences aroused opposition to him in some quarters. Early in Jan., 1410, he made before the university a cautious speech in favor of Wyclif's philosophical views, and this was cited against him at the council of Constance four years later. In Mar., 1410, the bull against Wyclif's writings was issued, and on the charge of favoring them Jerome was imprisoned in Vienna, but managed to escape into Moravia. For this he was excommunicated by the bishop of Cracow. Returned to Prague, he appeared publicly as the advocate of Huss. In 1413 he was in the courts of Poland and Lithuania, making a deep impression by his eloquence and learning. In Cracow he was publicly examined as to his acceptance of the forty-five articles which the enemies of

Wyclif had made up from Wyclif's writings and which they asserted represented Wyclif's heretical teachings. Jerome declared that he rejected them in their general tenor.

When, on Oct. 11, 1414, Huss left for the council of Constance, Jerome assured him that if need be he would come to his assistance. This promise he faithfully kept, for on Apr. 4, 1415, he arrived at Constance. As he had, unlike Huss, come without a safe-conduct, his friends persuaded him to return to Bohemia. But on his way back he was arrested at Hirschau on Apr. 20 and taken to Sulzbach, where he was imprisoned, and was returned to Constance on May 23, and immediately arraigned before the council on the charge of fleeing a citation—one having been really issued against him, but as he was away at the time he was ignorant of it. His condemnation was predetermined in consequence of his general acceptance of the views of Wyclif, and also because of his open admiration of Huss. Consequently he had not a fair hearing. His imprisonment was so rigorous that he fell seriously ill and so was induced to recant at public sessions of the council held on Sept. 11 and 23, 1415. The words put into his mouth on these occasions made him renounce both Wyclif and Huss. The same physical weakness made him write in Bohemian letters to the king of Bohemia and to the University of Prague, which were declared to be entirely voluntary and to state his own opinions, in which he announced that he had become convinced that Huss had been rightfully burned for heresy. But this pitiful course did not secure his liberation nor decrease the likelihood of his condemnation. For on May 23, 1416, and on May 26, he was put on trial by the council. On the second day he boldly recanted his recantation, and so on May 30 he was finally condemned and immediately thereafter burned. He died heroically.

Jerome was of blameless life, and his attachment to the Roman Church was sincere; consequently, as he rejected Wyclif's teachings as to the Lord's Supper, the council really had slender grounds for his execution. His extensive travels, his wide erudition, his eloquence, his wit, made him a formidable critic of the degenerate church of his day, and it was for his criticisms rather than for heresy that his death was compassed.

Bibliography: The contemporary sources of his life are the well-known letter of Poggio Bracciolini describing his trial (*Opera*, pp. 301–305, translated by William Shepherd, *Life of Poggio Bracciolini*, 2d ed., 1837, pp. 69–79), and the chronicle of Jan Zizkovi, edited by Jaroslav Goll in Bohemian and published in Prague in 1878, *Vypsani o Mistru Jeronymovi z Prahu*. It has been followed by the Bohemian scholars, A. H. Wratislaw in his *John Huss*, London, 1882, pp. 376–408; and Count Lützow, *John Hus*, ib. 1909, pp. 321–334. Consult further: L. Heller, *Hieronymus von Prag*, Lübeck, 1835; C. Becker, *Die beiden böhmischen Reformatoren . . . Hus und Hieronymus von Prag*, Nördlingen, 1858; E. H. Gillett, *Life and Times of John Huss*, 2 vols., New York, 1871; and the literature under Huss, John.

JEROME, SAINT, ORDERS OF. See Hieronymites; Jesuates.

JERUSALEM.

I. Topography.
II. Water Supply.
III. Soil and Formation.
IV. Climate.
V. History of the City.
  Pre-Israelitic Jerusalem (§ 1).
  Davidic and Solomonic Jerusalem (§ 2).
  From Solomon to the Exile (§ 3).
  From the Exile to Herod (§ 4).
  From Herod to the Destruction, 70 A.D. (§ 5).
  Until Constantine the Great (§ 6).
  From Constantine to the Capture by the Arabs (§ 7).
  Under the Arabs to the Crusades (§ 8).
  During the Crusades (§ 9).
  From 1187 to the Present (§ 10).

I. Topography: The ground upon which Jerusalem stands is formed by a plateau extending southward from the Palestinian mountain range, and cut by valleys into several heights. The culmination of the range or watershed runs west of the city, and the surface on which the city is built slopes to the east and south, and on the south and southeast sinks abruptly into deep valleys. The watershed northwest and north of the city rises to a height of 2,675 feet above the Mediterranean; the lowest place in modern Jerusalem is 2,360 feet in elevation; while the whole city is situated at a lower elevation than the country round about. The heights about the city are in part still known by their old names. That to the east is the Mount of Olives (Zech. xiv. 4; Matt. xxi. 1), in early times the site of a sanctuary (II Sam. xv. 32). Looking from the city, it is seen to have four summits, of which the second from the north (*Karam al-Ṣayyad*) is the highest (2,680 feet), while the third (*Jabal-al-Ṭur*), from twenty to forty feet lower, on which are several consecrated buildings, passes in common speech as the Mount of Olives. The most southern peak (*Baṭn al-Hawa*, 2,430 feet high) was known as the Mount of Corruption or Destruction (II Kings xxiii. 13; cf. I Kings xi. 7). The hill to the west corresponds probably to the hill Gareb of Jer. xxxi. 39, rising to the height of 2,555 feet; that to the south, called Goah in Jer. xxxi. 39 (2,545 feet high), is the modern *Abu Ṭur*, called by Europeans the Hill of Evil Counsel, on the basis of John xi. 47–53. The elevation north of the city is called Skopos by Josephus (*Ant.* XI., viii. 5).

The principal valley is that of the Kidron, rising north of the city, bending east and then south, and dividing the city from the Mount of Olives, all the time deepening rapidly. At present, parts of this valley bear different names. Of tributary valleys may be mentioned one which in early times emptied opposite the Garden of Gethsemane of the Latins immediately below the Golden Gate of the present east wall of the Haram al-Sharif; it is now practically filled up. Formerly it was formed of two branches which served to divide the city, as is shown by the researches of Warren and Wilson. Another tributary valley used to empty immediately north of the Virgin's Fount, opposite the upper part of the village of Silwan, but is now completely filled. A third empties below the Pool of Siloam, opposite the lower part of the village of Silwan, and rises in two hollows above the Damascus Gate. It runs first southeast, then south, and then again southeast, being joined about the middle of its course by a valley coming from the west. Both this and the valley which joins it are now filled up, but their importance for the old city must have been great. The name as given by Josephus (*War*, V., iv. 1) is the Tyropœon valley. A fourth tributary valley empties into the Kidron still farther south than the Tyropœon. It begins in the watershed west of the present Jaffa Gate, runs south and then east till it joins the Kidron opposite the southern end of Silwan, falling a distance of 650 feet in its course. It has different names for different parts, but is in general known as the valley of Hinnom (Josh. xv. 8 and often; cf. Gehenna). It is remarkable that Eusebius and Jerome place the valley of Hinnom to the east of Jerusalem, but they were probably influenced by Zech. xiv. 3–4. In the eighteenth century it became the erroneous fashion to call the upper and middle part of this valley the Gihon.

II. Water Supply: The preceding description shows that the drainage of the region is from north to south or from northwest to southeast. While the watershed is at an elevation of 2,675 feet, the union of the Kidron and Hinnom valleys is only 2,065 feet above the Mediterranean; there is therefore no deadwater in the brooks which in the rainy season flow through these valleys. Part of the drainage is subterranean. The hill country of Palestine is poor in water, and such expressions as "the brook Kidron" may convey a false impression if it is not recalled that "brook" means no more than the Arabic "wadi," a natural channel of drainage for the flow of the rainy season, dry the rest of the year except near a spring. In the upper and lower parts the valleys are tilled; between the city and the Mount of Olives the floor of the valley is denuded of soil. In the Kidron water flows only during exceptional rainfall or when there is a quick melting of a heavy snowfall. A shallow brook runs even yet in the Tyropœon after long-continued rains, forming a pool called the Birkat al-Ḥamra. In the Hinnom valley a small ditch between the garden plats suffices to carry off the drainage. The region is poor in springs, the Old Testament naming only three, Gihon, En-rogel, and the Dragon's Well. The Gihon was in the Kidron valley (II Chron. xxxiii. 14), and its waters were led by Hezekiah into the City of David (II Chron. xxxii. 30). These data serve to identify it with the only spring which is found to-day in the Kidron valley near Jerusalem and feeds the pool of Siloam through the Siloam conduit. It is known now as the Virgin's Fount and the Fountain of Steps, the second name due to the fact that the water is reached by a stone stairway. The spring is covered by an arch to protect it from débris, and lies in a deep hollow some seventy-five feet lower than the heaps of débris round about. It is intermittent, but rather irregularly so; in winter it may flow three or four times a day, in summer once or twice, in autumn at most once. This peculiarity is probably to be explained by the fact that the spring has two sources in the hill, one constant and one variable, the latter intermittent and fed from below. Doubtless the action of this spring influenced the prophetic representations in Ezek. xlvii. 1–12; Joel iv. (iii.) 18; Zech. xiv. 8, which went upon the supposition that there were great chambers of water in the interior of the mountain. Josephus calls the water of this spring sweet; at present it is brackish. The second spring, En-rogel (Josh. xv. 7, xviii. 16), was on the boundary between Judah and Benjamin, and at some distance from the city (II Sam. xvii. 17; I Kings i. 9, 41 sqq.), in the royal gardens south of the city (Josephus, *Ant.* VII., xiv. 4); therefore it is to be sought near the union of the valley of Hinnom with that of Kidron. There is now no spring in the region, but there is a well, called by the Arabs Job's Well, by Jews Joab's Well, and by Christians Nehemiah's Well, having a depth of 122 feet, partly walled and partly sunk in the rock. In very wet seasons it fills up and drains off a part of its water, a circumstance regarded by the inhabitants as presaging a fruitful season. From this overflow it probably got its name as a spring, though in earlier times, when the country was wooded, its overflow may have been constant and so justified the name of spring. About a third of a mile south and on the west side of the valley is a spring which flows during the rainy season, and in early times may have been constant. A third spring, the Dragon's Well, appears to be mentioned in Neh. ii. 13 (LXX, "Spring of Figs"), as approached from the valley gate, which was probably at the southwest corner of the old city. It should therefore lie in the lower Hinnom valley or in the Kidron valley; but no spring or well besides those already mentioned is now known.

III. Soil and Formation: The old city was built upon the naked rock. The situation is altogether unfavorable to the formation of vegetable soil and to the retention of any which may be artificially created, since the heavy rainfall of winter washes it into the crevices of the rocks or sweeps it into the valleys. Disintegration of the rock produces a rich loamy soil which adheres well to the rocky substratum where the lie of the land permits it. The rock is a crystalline chalk of the middle cretaceous period, and of dark gray color. Varieties distinguished at the present are: a pure hippuritic chalkstone, granular, not hard, esteemed for building, not blemished by cracks, when quarried generally pure white, and hardening with exposure to the atmosphere; a second variety, of three kinds, either gray or marked with red and gray veins and not found in such large masses as the first variety; a variety which laminates and does not break in the fire; a fourth variety, so soft as to receive and retain the imprint of the fingers, sometimes, however, hard and worked with the saw, reddened often through infiltration of iron, and generally used for the little sarcophagi so numerous in the neighborhood.

IV. Climate: The usual rainy season is from October to May, rarely September to June, while the average rainfall for the year is about twenty-three inches, and the southwest and west winds carry the rain clouds. Snow may fall from December to March, rarely in April, though it does not often lie long. The temperature ranges from 25° to 102° Fahrenheit, with high average for July of 77° and for January of 43°. Ice may form at night in January, but melts during the day except in shady spots. The atmospheric humidity ranges widely. The prevailing winds are from the northwest, though the radiation of the land in summer often produces a sea breeze from the Mediterranean which lasts well through the night and brings much moisture. East winds blow in autumn, winter, and spring, rarely in summer. The sirocco blows from the southwest. The months in which sickness prevails are May to October. The preceding data are the result of observations taken during the second half of the nineteenth century, and the question has been raised whether the climate is the same as it was in early times (see PALESTINE). Here it need be said only that great changes are improbable; such changes as may have taken place are most likely in the direction of greater contrast of temperature and of reduced rainfall. But Jerusalem must always have been a city not abundantly supplied with water, as is proved by the many devices for conserving the rainfall.

1. Pre-Israelitic Jerusalem.

V. History of the City: It is clear that the name Jerusalem was not given by the Israelites, since it appears c. 1400 B.C. in the Amarna Tablets (q.v.) in the form *Urusalim*, which corresponds consonantally with the Hebrew form of the name, though the vocalization of the last syllable is different in the Old Testament but not in the Aramaic or Septuagint. The form *Yerushalayim* is Massoretic. The legend of the founding of the city reported by Josephus (*Apion*, i. 14 sqq.) and Plutarch (*Isis et Osiris*, xxxi.) goes back to Manetho, who attributes the building of the city to the Hyksos when they left Egypt. But the legend unites the Hyksos and the Hebrews in a manner which prevents giving credit to the story. The earliest mention is that of the Amarna Tablets ut sup., in which Ebed-Ḫiba appears as tributary to the Pharaoh, while the correspondence suggests that the ruler of Jerusalem was charged with oversight of the princelings of southern Syria (cf. the representation in Judges i. 5–7 of Adoni-bezek with his seventy subject kings). The Israelitic accounts dealing with the time c. 1020 B.C. make the Jebusites masters of Jerusalem and the immediate surroundings, and Zion the stronghold (II Sam. v. 7). Until the second half of the nineteenth century Zion and the City of David were located between the valleys of Hinnom and the Tyropœon at the southwest corner of the city. At present scholars agree that Zion was applied to the eastern part of the city and that the southeastern hill corresponds to the fortress of Jebus. The " city of David " is not to be confused with " Jerusalem," since it formed only a part of the greater whole (cf. II Kings xiv. 20). The city of David was situated on lower ground than the temple and the palace of Solomon (II Sam. xxiv. 18; I Kings viii. 1–4), and Solomon's palace lay lower than the temple (II Kings xi. 19), from which it was separated only by a wall (Ezek. xliii. 8). The location of the temple, it is agreed, was on the site of the present Mosque of Omar, whence the directions implied in the foregoing data can lead one only to the southeastern hill between the Kidron and the Tyropœon. This conclusion is fully corroborated by the indications in Neh. iii. 15–26, xii. 31–39 compared with ii. 13–14. According to II Sam. v. 6 the fortress of Zion was difficult of access, which corresponds with the situation to the east and the south of the southeastern corner of Jerusalem, and it must have been protected to the west by the Tyropœon before the latter was filled with débris. Similarly on the north a ravine extended, mentioned above as one of the tributary valleys of the Kidron. Consequently at that early time the fortress was entirely isolated by ravines, while the boundaries suggested probably marked out the city of the Jebusites, placed on the lowest of the eminences in the neighborhood. The Jerusalem of the Amarna Tablets has been placed westward of Jebus and on the southwest hill of the modern city.

2. Davidic and Solomonic Jerusalem.

With the capture of the Jebusite fortress Jerusalem fell into David's hands, and this may have been while he was still king of Hebron. He was thus placed in contact with the northern tribes and in command of the roads, while the stronghold became the capital of his kingdom, a place belonging neither to Judah nor to the northern tribes, and therefore neutral. But because of David's relationship to Judah, it is sometimes ascribed to Judah, while elsewhere it is called Benjamin's territory because of its situation. David did not exterminate the Jebusites, but left them life and property (II Sam. xxiv. 18); he forced them, however, to evacuate Zion, whence they went to the southwest elevation, while he and his following occupied " the city of David." The old fortress was completely transformed, being built up by David, and a palace erected there (II Sam. v. 9, 11; cf. Neh. xii. 37) upon one of the western levels of the hill, while the tombs were hewn out still lower; the fortification was completed by walls and towers, the remains of which have been traced. In this part of the city was the tabernacle-sanctuary (II Sam. vi. 17), and here were the residences for the people of the court, as well as a great number of cisterns for water supply. Solomon extended the building toward the north and built the Millo for protection, though as yet the exact location of this defensive work is not determined and the same is true as to its exact character—whether it was a wall or a tower. Solomon's palace and temple were to the north and on higher ground, the temple on Moriah and the palace on Ophel, the latter surrounded by defensive walls, probably pierced with great gates on the south, where were the principal approaches. The arrangement included three parts, a greater court with an inner court containing the temple, and a second or middle court (I Kings vii. 8, 12; II Kings xx. 4), the temple thus being the farthest north, while these separate parts were probably upon different levels. In the great court to the south were the house of Lebanon, the hall of pillars, and the throne hall. The middle court contained Solomon's palace and the palace of his Egyptian queen. To Solomon is ascribed the building of the wall which surrounded Jerusalem (I Kings iii. 1, ix. 15). The question of the extent of the city in those times and therefore of the extent and course of this wall is much debated. It must be borne in mind that a distinction was made between the "city of David" and Jerusalem, and by the latter was meant the city on the southwest hill, which must have been the part so protected by Solomon's wall, the course of which Josephus claims to give (*War*, V., iv. 2). Remains of a wall which may have been the northern part of Josephus's wall have been discovered south of David Street, viz., the so-called Wilson's arch; but the latter can hardly be ascribed to the time of Solomon. Investigations respecting the course of Solomon's wall have been carried on by the English engineer, H. Maudsley, and the American, F. J. Bliss, during which several gates have been discovered as well as the direction of the fortification, but whether these belonged to the erection of Solomon or to later times is not fully determined. The valley gate was probably at the southwest corner of the old city, the dung gate on the south, and the fountain gate to the east by the Tyropœon valley (formerly called the gate between the two walls, Jer. xxxix. 4).

3. From Solomon to the Exile.

The successors of Solomon, according to the Old Testament, often added to the fortifications of the city, and probably all the additions made are not mentioned in the records. Of special importance is the report that Hezekiah built "the other wall" (II Chron. xxxii. 5), i.e., one outside what had been till then the city limits, called by Josephus the second wall (*War*, V., iv. 2). A good basis for tracing this wall is found in Neh. iii. (cf. xii. 31, 37–40), and some remains have been discovered which are with good reason identified with the wall of Nehemiah. These remains are to the north of the so-called David's Tower, under the foundation of the German Evangelical Church, and still farther near the northwest corner of the Haram al-Sharif. This wall was pierced by two gates, called the old gate and the fish gate (Neh. iii. 6, xii. 39); the first was probably near the quarter of the Holy Sepulcher corner of the city, by the Prussian Hospice of St. John; the fish gate must have led to the Tyropœon. From Zeph. i. 10 it may be deduced that in this quarter or new city the Phenician traders had their shops. The towers of Hananeel and Hammeah (Jer. xxxi. 38; Neh. iii. 1) are usually located on the site of the later Antonia, and not far to the east must have been the sheep gate (Neh. iii. 1), perhaps identical with the gate of Benjamin (Jer. xxxvii. 13). A short distance east of the sheep gate the wall bent southward to follow the bank of the Kidron; the complete course of the wall is not yet made out, but that it changed direction several times is clear from Neh. iii. 19–20, 24–25, while iii. 26 compared with xii. 37 leaves doubtful the location of the water gate giving toward the east. Other gates mentioned are the middle gate (Jer. xxxix. 3), the gate of potsherds (Jer. xix. 2), the first gate of Zech. xiv. 10 near the corner gate, the gate of the guard (II Kings xi. 19, belonging to Solomon's palace), and the horse gate (Neh. iii. 28), the locations of which have not been found. The residents continued to make provision for water supply by hewing or constructing cisterns in which to collect rain-water. Neh. iii. 16 mentions an artificial pool in the city of David, called "the pool that was made," probably to distinguish it from the natural pools theretofore used. It is difficult to locate all the cisterns or pools mentioned in the Old Testament. The upper pool of Isa. xxxvi. 2 seems to have been to the north or northwest of the old city, perhaps therefore the Mamilla pool west of the Gaza gate or the pool of Hezekiah; but many have distinguished the former as the upper pool and the latter as the lower pool (Isa. xxii. 9). The reservoir between the two walls of Isa. xxii. 11 is to be sought in the Tyropœon valley between the city of David and Jerusalem; the pool of Shelah of Neh. iii. 15 is identified by many with that of Siloam. The inhabitants sought in three ways to make available the waters of the Gihon spring; an approach through the rock of the hill, a channel from the foot of the hill southward in the neighborhood of the water gate, and a tunnel conducting the water into the city. The first was discovered by Charles Warren in 1867–68; the second, in part, by Conrad von Schick in 1886 and 1890, found to be partly a covered channel, partly a tunnel; the third is the famous Siloam tunnel (in which is the Siloam inscription, q.v.), hewn not in a straight line, but first leading west from the spring, then south, and finally west again into the king's pool of Neh. ii. 14. If it be right to attribute this tunnel to Hezekiah, the other means of leading the water into the city belong to an earlier age, the first perhaps going back to the time of David or of the Jebusites. Signs indicate that during the Davidic dynasty numerous attempts were made to supply the city with water from a distance. To the south of Bethlehem is a group of waterworks which divide into three parts. To the west of the little village of Artas, three hours south of Jerusalem, are three great pools called the pools of Solomon, fed partly by springs in the neighborhood, partly by two canals, the one leading from the Wadi al-Biyar emptying into the upper pool, the other from the Wadi al-‘Arrub emptying into the middle pool. The connection with Jerusalem was by two channels, an upper and a lower, of which the upper has a remarkable peculiarity. At first an ordinary canal, at the grave of Rachel it becomes a line of piping, which sinks and then rises farther on, built of stones bored into hollow cylinders fitting closely together and laid in a bed of masonry. This breaks off north of the tomb of Rachel, and from there only indistinct traces are discoverable. This must be regarded as ancient, possibly Solomonic or Davidic; the date of the lower channel is about that of Herod the Great. Besides these two conduits, traces of a third have been found.

4. From the Exile to Herod.

The capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar, 587–586 B.C., resulted in the burning of the temple, the royal palace, and the larger dwellings of the city; the encircling wall was also thrown down. The remnant of inhabitants left by the conqueror in the city was too poor and dispirited to think of rebuilding. Gedaliah had his residence in Mizpah, which indicates the unfitness of Jerusalem as a capital. From Haggai (i. 4) is first heard the story of rebuilding in the year 519 B.C. and of the rebuilding of the temple 519–15 B.C., though the stress of circumstances continued to be felt. In 445 B.C. Nehemiah came with full powers from Artaxerxes I., rebuilt the wall and erected its gates in fifty-two days (Neh. iii., xii. 27–43), finishing with a festival. The most of the repairs had to be made on the north, east, and south, while mention is made of the house of the mighty men, the great tower of the upper palace, and David's palace (Neh. iii. 16, 25, xii. 37) as though still standing. The priests were masters of the temple and its vicinity, while some dwelt in the neighborhood of the old Davidic residence (Neh. iii. 20 sqq.). From Neh. xi. 4–19 it may be gathered that the population when Nehemiah came was about 10,000, a small number for so large a space (Neh. vii. 4). But during the next two centuries the city must have grown greatly in spite of the damage it suffered from Persians and Egyptians. In 198 B.C. it came into the power of the Seleucidæ. It is after this that mention is made of a fortress inside the city held by a foreign force and called the Akra (or the acropolis). It is related in I Macc. i. 33–37 that the officers of Antiochus IV. fortified the city of David with a strong wall, and that this became a menace to the sanctuary. In thus distinguishing the city of David from the rest of the city, and both of these from the temple hill, the author of Maccabees follows Old-Testament usage. The supposition that the Akra hill overlooked the temple contradicts all testimony regarding the relative levels. The importance of David's city was gradually lessened by means of the temple hill. The high priest Simon (Ecclus. l. 1) and later the Hasmonean Judas (I Macc. iv. 60) fortified the temple, and Jonathan renewed the protection after Antiochus Eupator had destroyed it. Thus Zion became a fortress inside the unwalled city. The encircling wall of the city was restored by the Hasmoneans several times, and they also cut off the Akra by a high wall to shut out the garrison from the market. Another work of this period was the palace of the Hasmoneans, west of the temple and on higher ground, probably on the edge of the southwest hill, the upper city of Josephus (*Ant.* XIV., i. 2). It came later into the possession of the Herods, and was occupied by Agrippa II. when he stayed in Jerusalem. Near it, but lower in the Tyropœon valley, was the Xystos, either a great hall or an open place, while across on the east side of the valley was the council-house of the Sanhedrin and near it the hall of records. Toward the end of this period belongs probably the description of Jerusalem found in the letter of Aristeas, in all likelihood based on Hecataios of Abdera.

5. From Herod to the Destruction, 70 A.D.

For the next period Josephus is the authority, and he distinguishes between the upper city, or the upper market, the lower city, the temple or the temple hill, the proasteion, and the new city or Bezetha, but never uses the name Zion. The upper city lay opposite the temple and the lower city; the latter was the Akra, south of the temple and situated on the lowest level within the walls; the proasteion coincided with the new city enclosed within the so-called second wall of the post-Solomonic kings; the new city of Josephus arose in the decade after Herod to the north of the temple and westward about the wall to the tower of Hippicus. Still farther, Josephus distinguishes between Bezetha, the new city, and the wood market; Bezetha lay north of the temple and Antonia and east of the street leading from the gate by the Women's Tower to Antonia. His account can not be followed without a knowledge of the earlier arrangement of the city. Through Herod's building operations the city took on something of the splendor of a Grecian city. Besides the temple he erected a stately tower, which he named Antonia in honor of the Roman triumvir, and the palace of Herod (located by its three great towers, Hippicus, Phasael, and Mariamne) which commanded the city as the Antonia commanded the temple hill. The three towers served as a protection for the city as well as for the palace (cf. for description of towers and palace Josephus, *War*, V., iv. 3–4). The palace was occupied later by Archelaus and Agrippa I.; when the Romans appointed a procurator over Judea, it was ceded to him and his guard. Gessius Florus and Pontius Pilate are said to have had their judgment seat in front of the structure, hence here must be sought the pretorium. In the upper city was the hippodrome, and Herod is said to have built a theater in Jerusalem and an amphitheater in the plain (the latter probably discovered in 1887 by Dr. Schick above Bir Eyyub). Finally, Herod took care for the water supply of the city. Schick has shown that the lower of the two conduits from the pools south of the city near Artas is of Herod's building. It begins immediately below the lowest of the three pools and is carried in a winding course past Bethlehem to Jerusalem as a masonry or hewn canal covered with flat stones, only twice taking the character of a tunnel. It has been repaired or improved several times—by Pontius Pilate, again in the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries, and in 1865. The third wall to the north of Jerusalem protects the "new city" of Josephus. Agrippa I. began to build it, but ceased because of the distrust of the Romans. At the outbreak of the Jewish war it was again undertaken and speedily finished. It was pierced by many gates, the names of which are unknown; one, protected by the so-called Women's Tower, was probably where the Damascus Gate now is. Its course was approximately that of the present north wall. The inhabitants of Jerusalem at this time, including the guests at the Passover, are reckoned by Josephus at 2,700,000 (*War*, VI., ix. 3; cf. II., xiv. 3); Schick would place the normal population at the beginning of the Christian era at from 200,000 to 250,000. In the reign of the Emperor Claudius (41–54 A.D.), Queen Helena of Adiabene on the upper Tigris, her son Izates, and other members of her family became converts to Judaism and built residences for themselves in the lower city (Josephus, *War*, IV., ix. 11, V., vi. 1). Agrippa I. had the streets of the city paved to give occupation to the great number of laborers left without work (Josephus, *Ant.*, XX., ix. 7). The Amygdalon pool mentioned in *War*, V., xi. 4 is doubtless the pool of Hezekiah; the name is a Greek form of the Hebrew *mighdal*, "tower," and the pool was near the Mariamne tower of the palace. The Struthion pool of *War*, V., xi. 4 lay north of Antonia, but its site is not yet certainly recovered. The location of the pool of Bethesda is also uncertain; it seems to have been near the sheep gate and north of the temple. Dr. Schick has located the Bethesda of the Middle Ages to the west of the church of St. Anne north of the temple. Gethsemane lay at the foot of the Mount of Olives, certainly not far from the city, according to John xviii. 1 a garden, and the site of the betrayal of Jesus. The present garden in the possession of the Franciscans has been known since the tenth or eleventh century, but there are indications that the earlier site was farther to the north. The Herodian monument was located to the west of this, above the valley of Hinnom, and has been identified by Dr. Schick. The tomb of Queen Helena of Adiabene was about a third of a mile from the north wall of the city (*Ant.* XX., iv. 3); it is probably the crypt with court, portal, and numerous chambers known as the King's Tomb north of the Damascus Gate.

6. Until Constantine the Great.

The city suffered greatly during the siege and gradual capture under Titus. His express command to destroy the city received willing obedience from the embittered Roman soldiery. Titus regarded only the three towers of the palace as worth preserving, and he spared the western part of the city wall, as it guarded the camp of the garrison on the southwest hill in the upper city. The investment of the city began at the Passover, when there was present a vast number of visitors, so that the count of Josephus (*War*, VI., ix., x.) is not improbable. The place where the faith of the Jews had received so severe a blow was naturally avoided by them and Jabne (Jamnia) became the center of Jewish life in Palestine. The young Christian community, which before the investment by Titus withdrew to Pella, east of the Jordan, had as headquarters the house of John Mark and his mother Mary (Acts xii. 12–17). Probably there was the great upper chamber (Mark xiv. 15) in which Jesus celebrated the last supper and also the chamber mentioned in Acts i. 13 and ii. Although the site of this place is pointed out by a tradition reaching to the fourth century, there is no doubt concerning its correctness. Epiphanius of Salamis (392 A.D.) reports (*De mensuris*, xiv.) that when Hadrian made his visit to Jerusalem in 130–131 he found city and temple destroyed except for a few dwellings and the little Christian church on what was then called Mount Zion. Since the time of Cyril of Jerusalem this church, or another built on its site, has been well known; it corresponds to the present *Nebi Da'ud* on the southwest hill south of the wall and above the tombs of the Davidic dynasty. The name Zion was probably attached to the church through an extension of usage out of the Old Testament, since the name is not found used of a part of the city by Josephus. According to this usage the place of assemblage of the early Christian community came to be called "the holy Zion"; out of this grew the identification of the southwest hill as Mount Zion, and so the topographic signification of the term was lost. Hadrian made an end of the desolation of the city and commanded that it be rebuilt as a Roman colony; during the rising of Bar Kokba it was for a few years a free city, after that again a Roman colony, but without the *jus Italicum*, and was called Ælia Capitolina, shortened in common speech to Ælia, in the Arabic to Iliya, till the late Middle Ages. The city deity was Jupiter Capitolinus, whose temple was on the site of the Jewish temple. Jews were excluded from the new city under pain of death. The area was diminished, and the old city of David was outside the city limits. In this period were fixed the form and topography of the city which have survived till the present.

7. From Constantine to the Capture by the Arabs.

The heathen character of the city did not prevent Christians from visiting or settling there; pilgrimages began in the third century and were numerous in the fourth. Helena, the mother of Constantine, came there in 326–327 and had churches built on the sites of the birth and ascension of Christ, in Bethlehem, and on the Mount of Olives (for Constantine's building see HOLY SEPULCHER). Constantine relaxed the harsh laws against the Jews, Julian gave them permission to restore their temple, but after Julian the earlier prohibitions against the Jews seem to have been renewed. In the second half of the fourth century eremites and monks from Egypt and Syria began to crowd into Palestine, in the fifth and sixth centuries causing bloody feuds through dogmatic strife. The first monastery in Jerusalem seems to have been built in the fifth century. The coming of the Empress Eudocia, consort of Theodosius II., in 438 had great consequences for the city. To her is ascribed the renewal of the old wall to the south, and various sacred sites were joined to the city. She built the Church of St. Stephen (possibly included in the present possessions of the Dominicans). The Emperor Justinian had the architect Georgios of Constantinople erect a great basilica (that of the Theotokos) in connection with a pilgrims' house and a hospital in the middle of the city, perhaps south of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. The capture of the city by the Persians under Chosroes II. (614) resulted in the destruction of most of the ecclesiastical structures, in the restoration of which the abbot Modestus showed great zeal, though when the Emperor Heraclius marched in (638), much of the city was in ruins. In 638 the Caliph Omar took Jerusalem.

8. Under the Arabs to the Crusades.

The stipulations of the surrender to the effect that civic and ecclesiastical protection should be given and that the churches were not to be used as dwellings were observed with comparative good faith. The Arabs named the city *Bait al-Muḳaddas* or *al-Maḳdis*, "Place of the Sanctuary," shortened to *al-Ḳuds*, but made Lydda their first military capital in Palestine. Only occasionally had the pilgrims cause to complain of hard usage, the relations between the East and the West being good under the friendship of Charlemagne and Harun al-Raschid. In the tenth century began the strife between Islam and Christianity, furthered by the bad faith of the Egyptian Fatimides, who disregarded all treaties; the pilgrims were compelled to pay a fee for entrance into the city, and the Caliph al-Hakim in 1010 began a severe persecution of the Christians. Merchants from Amalfi, however, gained a footing in Jerusalem with permission to trade, and soon had a church (Sancta Maria Latina) and a monastery (Monasterium de Latina) to the south of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher.

9. During the Crusades.

When Godfrey of Bouillon captured the city, July 15, 1099, only two churches were found uninjured, that of the Holy Sepulcher and that of the Italian merchants, for the latter of which tribute was paid. During the continuance of the kingdom of Jerusalem great zeal was displayed in building. The principal gates of this period were David's gate (Jaffa gate), Stephen's (Damascus), Jehoshaphat's, and Zion gate in the south. Near David's gate was David's tower (the present citadel, often repaired from the ruins of Herod's palace), hence the later location of the "city of David." Extensive building operations went on within the grounds of the Amalfi merchants; the Benedictines built a hospital in honor of Johannes Eleemon (q.v.) in connection with which a community dressed in black robes with a white cross came into being—the beginning of the Knights of St. John. The Hospitalers under the patronage of John the Baptist took over the woman's guest-house. Since the Latins located the pretorium north of the Zion Church, later northwest of the temple square, the direction of the Via Dolorosa was placed accordingly. The pool of Bethesda (John v. 2) was placed by them near the Church of St. Anna, discovered in 1888 northwest of this site; later it was located north of the Haram al-Sharif. The Church of St. Anne was known as early as the seventh century, was repaired by the Franks, and later was connected with a nunnery. The hills to the west and south of the Hinnom valley were called Gihon. In the valley of Jehoshaphat the Franks repaired the tomb of the Virgin Mary and its church; while on the third peak of Olivet stood, about 1130, a great Church of the Ascension, where Constantine had built a sanctuary.

10. From 1187 to the Present.

Jerusalem opened its gates to the victorious Saladin Oct. 2, 1187. Most of the Latin Christians departed; the Greeks remained. The Christian and Occidental character which the city had assumed during the crusades soon changed as Christian churches and cloisters became mosques or Mohammedan schools. Saladin had the walls renewed when Richard the Lion-hearted threatened a siege in 1191–92, but the Sultan Malik al-Muazzam of Damascus ordered them destroyed that they might not become a protection to the Christians (1219–20). A treaty between the German Frederick II. and the Egyptian Sultan al-Kamil secured the city for the Christians (except the Haram al-Sharif) for about ten years and a half from Feb. 1, 1229, after which Nasir Daud, prince of Kerak, took the city and destroyed the walls. The Egyptian Sultan Eyyub took it in 1244, in 1517 it fell under the power of the Turks under Selim I., and his successor Solyman in 1542 gave to the walls of the city their present form. Syria was in the possession of Mehemet Ali of Egypt 1831–40. In 1219 the Franciscans gained a footing in the city, in the thirteenth century held firmans under the Egyptian sultans, in 1333 came into possession of the Zion Church and perhaps of other sacred places, some of which they had to yield to Solyman in 1523 and 1551; their present location, northwest of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, was obtained in 1559. Since the conquest of Jerusalem by the Turks the Christian powers, with France in the lead, have protected the Roman Catholic Christians in Palestine, Russia has cared for the Greek Christians. A revolution in the situation at Jerusalem was brought about by the English (1826) and American (1821) missionaries; an English consulate was established there in 1839, a Prussian in 1842. England and Prussia had the Evangelical bishopric of St. James created (see JERUSALEM, ANGLICAN-GERMAN BISHOPRIC IN). Other Christian powers thus had their attention drawn to the situation. The Greek patriarch Cyril transferred his seat from Constantinople to Jerusalem in 1845, and Rome reestablished the Latin patriarchate in 1847. Pilgrim-houses, hospitals, churches, schools and monasteries have been erected, and these mark the character of the peaceful crusade of the nineteenth century, with the result that Jerusalem is no more an Oriental city. Of its 60,000 inhabitants, 41,000 are Jews, 12,800 are Christians, 7,000 are Mohammedans. Of the Christians, 6,000 are Greeks, 4,000 Latins, 1,400 Protestants, 800 Armenians, 200 Uniate Greeks, 150 Copts, 100 Abyssinians, 100 Syrians, and 50 Uniate Armenians. The Jews are poverty-stricken and do not exert an influence corresponding to their numbers. (H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Lists of literature are the *Bibliotheca geographica Palestinae*, by R. Röhricht, Berlin, 1890, and by T. Tobler, Leipsic, 1867. Indispensable for following recent investigations are the *Quarterly Statements* of the PEF, also the files of *ZDPV*, the *Mitteilungen und Nachrichten* of the Deutscher Palästina-Verein, the files of *ZDMG*, *Recueil d'archéologie orientale*, and *JBL*. Valuable as summaries are the articles in *DB*, ii. 584–601; *EB*, ii. 2407–2432; *JE*, vii. 118–157; *DCG*, i. 849–859.

For excavations and topographical details consult: C. Warren, C. R. Conder, *Survey of Western Palestine, Jerusalem*, London, 1884; E. G. Schultz, *Jerusalem*, Berlin, 1845; W. Krafft, *Die Topographie Jerusalems*, Bonn, 1846; T. Tobler, *Die Siloahquelle und der Oelberg*, St. Gall, 1852; idem, *Zwei Bücher Topographie von Jerusalem*, ib. 1853–54; E. Pierotti, *Jerusalem Explored*, 2 vols., London, 1864; C. J. M. de Vogüé, *Le Temple de Jerusalem*, Paris, 1864; C. W. Wilson, *Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem*, 2 vols., Southampton, 1867–70; C. Wilson and C. Warren, *Recovery of Jerusalem*, London, 1871; P. Wolff, *Jerusalem*, Leipsic, 1872; C. Warren, *Underground Jerusalem*, London, 1876; H. Guthe, *Ausgrabungen bei Jerusalem*, Leipsic, 1883; C. Wilson, *Jerusalem the Holy City*, London, 1888; F. J. Bliss, *Excavations at Jerusalem, 1894–97*, London, 1898; C. Mommert, *Topographie des alten Jerusalem*, 4 vols., Leipsic, 1902–08; S. Merrill, *Ancient Jerusalem*, New York, 1908; G. A. Smith, *The Topography, Economics and History of Jerusalem to 70 A.D.*, 2 vols., London, 1908; Robinson, *Researches*, and *Later Researches*. On the question of the Akra consult C. E. Caspari, in *TSK*, 1864, pp. 309–328; G. Gatt, in *TQ*, lxvi (1884), 34–84, lxxi (1889), 77–125; idem, *Die Hügel von Jerusalem*, Freiburg, 1897.

For descriptions of the city consult: J. F. Thrupp, *Ancient Jerusalem*, London, 1855; A. B. MacGrigor, *Index of Passages . . . upon the Topography of Jerusalem*, Glasgow, 1876; C. Zimmermann, *Karten und Pläne zur Topographie des alten Jerusalem*, Basel, 1876; G. Williams, *The Holy City*, 2 vols., London, 1849; C. Ritter, *Comparative Geography of Palestine*, iv. 1–212, Edinburgh, 1866; W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, vol. i., New York, 1880; F. Spiess, *Das Jerusalem des Josephus*, Berlin, 1881; H. Nicole, *Plan topographique de Jerusalem et ses environs*, Paris, 1886–87; J. H. Lewis, *The Holy Places of Jerusalem*, London, 1888; G. R. Lees, *Jerusalem Illustrated*, ib. 1894; G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, passim, ib. 1897; F. Diekamp, *Hippolytus von Theben*, pp. 96 sqq., Münster, 1898; W. Sanday, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels*, Oxford, 1903; Miss A. Goodrich Freer, *Inner Jerusalem*, London, 1904 (an excellent description of the present city); Baedeker's Handbook on Syria and Palestine, 6th Germ. ed., Leipsic, 1904, 4th Eng. ed., 1906. Pictorial productions are G. Ebers and H. Guthe, *Palästina in Bild und Wort*, vol. i., Stuttgart, 1883; Hartmann-Benzinger, *Palästina*, Hamburg, 1889; and the views published by the PEF.

On the history of the city in the Biblical period consult: L. B. Paton, *Jerusalem in Bible Times*, Chicago, 1908; E. Bevan, *Jerusalem under the High Priests*, London, 1904; and the works on the history of Israel cited under Ahab. For later periods consult: C. J. M. de Vogüé, *Les Églises de la terre sainte*, Paris, 1860; T. Levin, *Siege of Jerusalem by Titus*, London, 1863; V. Guérin, *La Terre sainte*, 2 parts, Paris, 1884; J. Guy le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, London, 1890; G. Dodu, *Hist. des institutions monarchiques dans le royaume latin de Jerusalem*, Paris, 1894; *Jerusalem et ses principaux sanctuaires*, ib. 1895; C. A. Couret, *La Prise de Jerusalem . . . en 614; trois documents*, ib. 1896; C. R. Conder, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1099–1291*, London, 1897; S. Lane Poole, *Saladin and the Fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, New York, 1898; R. Röhricht, *Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem*, Berlin, 1898; W. Besant and E. H. Palmer, *Jerusalem, the City of Herod and Saladin*, London, 1899; A. Achleitner, *Jerusalem*, Mainz, 1905; W. S. Caldecott, *The Second Temple in Jerusalem*, London, 1908; and the publications of the Palestine Pilgrim Text Society.

Maps of value are the *Plan of Jerusalem* prepared by the PEF, and *Karte der Materialen zur Topographie des Alten Jerusalem*, accompanied by *Materialen zur Topographie des Alten Jerusalem*, both by A. Kümmel, Halle, 1904–06.

JERUSALEM, ANGLICAN-GERMAN BISHOPRIC IN: An episcopal see founded in Jerusalem in the nineteenth century by joint agreement of the Anglican and the German Lutheran churches. As a result of more than one missionary effort in the Holy Land in the earlier years of the century, and of the expedition sent thither in 1840 by the so-called Quadruple Alliance, Frederick William IV. of Prussia thought the occasion favorable for establishing a firm position for Evangelical Christians in that country. The Armenian, Greek, and Latin churches had long possessed the advantage of permanent corporations under treaty sanction, the two latter having also powerful protectors, while Protestants had no regular standing. The king therefore sent Bunsen on a special mission to Queen Victoria to lay before the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of London, who welcomed the proposal, a plan for the joint erection of a Protestant bishopric under the protection of England and Prussia. The endowment of the see was fixed at £30,000 in order to secure an annual income of £1,200 for the bishop, who was to be appointed by Prussia and England alternately; the archbishop of Canterbury, however, had a veto on the Prussian nomination; in other particulars the organization of the see was practically that of an Anglican bishopric, and its holder was at first subject to the metropolitan authority of Canterbury. His jurisdiction, which extended provisionally beyond Palestine over the Protestants of all Syria, Chaldea, Egypt, and Abyssinia, was to be exercised according to the canons and usages of the Church of England. An act of Parliament (Oct. 5, 1841) authorized the consecration of a bishop for a foreign country who need not be a subject of the British crown nor take the oath of allegiance, while, on the other hand, the clergy ordained by him would have no right to officiate in England or Ireland. It was agreed by both parties that the bishop should protect and aid German communities, among whom the cure of souls should be provided for by German clergy, ordained according to the English rite after examination and subscription of the three ecumenical creeds; that the liturgy was to be compiled from those received in the Lutheran church of Prussia and authorized by the archbishop of Canterbury; that confirmation was to be administered to the Germans by the bishop after the English form. These far-reaching concessions aroused great dissatisfaction among the German Lutherans, and the project was unfavorably received by the High Church party in England on opposite grounds. The first bishop appointed under the agreement was a Jewish convert, Michael Solomon Alexander (b. at Schönlanke, 50 m. n.n.w. of Posen, 1799; became a rabbi, and while serving at Plymouth was converted, 1825. He entered the ministry of the Church of England, became a missionary of the London Society for the Conversion of the Jews, and professor of Hebrew and rabbinical literature at King's College, London). He took up his residence in Jerusalem at the beginning of 1842, and died in the desert near Cairo Nov. 23, 1845. He was succeeded by Samuel Gobat (q.v.), a native of Crémine in the Bernese Alps, and a former missionary in Abyssinia. In his time it became evident that the joint bishopric could not endure. The German community showed a notable increase, numbering 200 members in 1875, and important charitable works were connected with it; a provisional chapel for their worship was erected in 1871, to be replaced by the larger church dedicated in the presence of the German emperor on Oct. 31, 1898. Meantime the relations between the German and English congregations had become more and more merely nominal. Bishop Gobat was succeeded in 1879 by an Englishman, Joseph Barclay (q.v.), who died two years later, and the next nomination came to Germany. The final separation was brought about by the insistence of the English Church that the bishop should subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles and be consecrated according to the English rite. Germany objected to this, and the agreement was finally abolished by the emperor on Nov. 3, 1886, [since which time the bishopric has been maintained by the English Church alone. The present incumbent, George Francis Popham Blyth (q.v.), was consecrated Mar. 25, 1887. His title is "Bishop of the Church of England in Jerusalem and the East," and his jurisdiction includes the English congregations in Egypt, the regions about the Red Sea, Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor (except portions attached to Gibraltar), and the Island of Cyprus].

(Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: Consult the literature under Gobat, Samuel; W. H. Heckler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric*, London, 1883;

H. Smith, *The Protestant Bishopric in Jerusalem*, ib. 1846; A. McCaul, *Jerusalem, its Bishop, its Missionaries*, ib. 1866; A. Riley, *Progress and Prospects of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Assyrian Christians*, ib. 1889; *Der Herr baut Jerusalem. Eine Denkschrift über das Werk der evangelischen Kirchen in Jerusalem*, Berlin, 1895.

JERUSALEM CHAMBER: A large hall in the deanery of Westminster, London, adjacent to the abbey. The origin of the name is obscure; possibly it is derived from the tapestries with which it is hung, representing in part scenes from Jerusalem or vicinity, including the adoration of the magi, the circumcision, and also the wanderings in the wilderness. The hall was built by Abbot Littlington between 1376 and 1386, and served as the guest-room or parlor of the abbot. In it Henry IV. died (Mar. 20, 1413) when about to set out on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and the prophecy that he was to die in Jerusalem was supposed thus to be fulfilled (cf. Shakespeare, *Henry IV.*, part II., act iv., scene 4). It became the meeting-place of the Westminster Assembly (q.v.) when cold weather came on in September, 1643, the hall being heated from its huge fireplace. There Addison (1719) and Congreve (1728) lay in state previous to burial in the abbey. It was the place of session of the company of revisers of the New Testament, and from it the Revised Version of the New Testament is dated: "Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster Abbey, 11th November, 1880." The revisers of the Old Testament also met there when the New-Testament company was not in session. It is the place of meeting of the lower house of convocation of the province of Canterbury.

Bibliography: A. P. Stanley, *Memorials of Westminster Abbey*, reissued in *Everyman's Library*, 1906; W. J. Loftie, *Westminster Abbey*, London, 1889.

JERUSALEM, PATRIARCHATE OF: A see of the Eastern Church (q.v.), supposed to have been founded by James, the brother of the Lord. Though Jerusalem has remained for Christianity the "holy city," it has never occupied an authoritative position. Nevertheless it produced some noteworthy men, and several synods of importance have been held there. During the crusades it was the center of interest as the object, not as the subject, of action. The patriarchate, that was established there in 451, could never be compared to other patriarchates, not even to that of Antioch. The city lost its importance after its capture by Titus and especially after Hadrian had made it, in 136, the *Ælia Capitolina* in which Jews were no longer tolerated, but the old name of the city never entirely vanished, although it was officially recognized again only in the fourth century. Eusebius states that until the time of Hadrian there were only Jewish Christian bishops in Jerusalem, and afterward only Christians converted from paganism. The list of bishops until c. 300 is contained in the church history of Eusebius and in his *Chronicon*, also in Epiphanius, but it is not wholly trustworthy. Among the Christian bishops of Jerusalem before Juvenal, under whom the patriarchate was founded, may be mentioned especially Narcissus, Alexander, Macarius, Maximus, a supporter of Athanasius, Cyril (q.v.), and John (see Origenistic Controversies). The Council of Nicæa decreed that according to ancient usage the bishop of Ælia should be honored, but the first rank should be given to the bishop of the "metropolis," by which undoubtedly Cæsarea was understood. The relation of Jerusalem to Cæsarea was naturally disturbed from that time. Ambitious and energetic bishops such as Maximus and especially Cyril did not recognize the bishop of Cæsarea as metropolitan. Cyril was opposed successfully by Acacius of Cæsarea, a not less vigorous personality. But Juvenal especially won for Jerusalem an important position. At the Council of Nicæa, however, the questions as to the rank of the bishops were still comparatively simple and only slightly developed from a legal standpoint. Only under the political organization of the empire undertaken by Diocletian did the church constitution provide rigidly circumscribed eparchies and dioceses, and only then did the capital of the political eparchy or metropolis have also ecclesiastical precedence. Jerusalem, however, obtained no political supremacy. Even when Palestine was divided into several distinct provinces by Valens, and afterward, it did not become a metropolis. In Palestina Prima, to which it belonged, Cæsarea remained the chief seat of the episcopacy, in Palestina Secunda it was Scythopolis, in Palestina Tertia Petra. Jerusalem was only fourth in rank.

Early Bishops.

Juvenal (q.v.) induced Emperor Theodosius II. to make him patriarch, and at the council of Chalcedon succeeded in obtaining the three Palestines as patriarchate. At the fifth ecumenical council of Constantinople in 553, it was ordered definitely that Jerusalem should possess the fifth see in the church. There are only a few prominent names in the long series of patriarchs. The history of the patriarchate is intimately connected with the vicissitudes of political history. In 637 the Mohammedans under Caliph Omar conquered Jerusalem, Patriarch Sophronius mediating the surrender on conditions regarding the toleration of Christian faith. Nevertheless there followed a time of great oppression, no patriarch being elected for more than sixty years (644–705), but even after the restoration of the patriarchate the church was almost always in a destitute condition. The crusades (conquest of Jerusalem 1099) caused a new interruption of the succession of patriarchs. The first patriarch elected after this period (in 1142?) resided at first in Constantinople; only after Saladin in 1187 had taken Jerusalem from the Franks did the patriarchs return to Palestine, although not immediately to the holy city. The chief importance of Palestine, especially of the neighborhood of Jerusalem, from early times lay in the fact that it had become the country of monks and hermits. In the sixth century Palestine took the leadership in Greek monasticism; through men like Euthymios (d. 473), Sabas (d. 532), and especially Theodosius (d. 529), Palestine became a shining example for the whole East, but after the tenth century its importance began to decrease.

During the Crusades.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Jerusalem became so desolate that the patriarchs, owing

In Middle Ages and Modern Times.

to the failure of their revenues, traveled to collect funds. Tamerlane conquered Syria in 1400, and afterward Palestine was ruled by the Mamelukes from Egypt. In 1517 the Ottoman sultan conquered Syria, and consequently the patriarchate of Jerusalem became dependent upon the ecumenical patriarchate in Constantinople. While in the time of the Arabs only natives of Palestine were patriarchs, now Greeks stepped into the foreground. Many patriarchs of the city fixed their residence at Constantinople; only since 1845 have the patriarchs permanently resided there. At the time of the foundation of the patriarchate the three Palestines comprised not less than fifty-nine bishoprics, at present there are only a few. There is still a metropolitan of Cæsarea, but in 1880 he ruled Haifa only, a place of a thousand inhabitants. Beside the metropolitan of Cæsarea there is still a metropolitan of Scythopolis and Petra, also one of Ptolemais, Bethlehem and Nazareth; beside them, six archbishops and one bishop. According to Baedeker (*Palestine and Syria*, pp. lix.–lxii., 4th ed., Leipsic, 1906), Syria and Palestine with 3,526,160 inhabitants has 978,068 Christians. The mutessarifat of Jerusalem is estimated to have 341,638 inhabitants (p. lx.), while the number of Christians in Jerusalem amounts to about 13,000 among 60,000 inhabitants (p. 24). There are 6,000 members of the orthodox Greek church in Jerusalem.

Latin Patriarchate and Other Bishoprics.

After the conquest of Jerusalem in 1099 Godfrey of Bouillon as king of the city established a Latin patriarchate which assumed the whole organization of the Palestinian church. The orthodox patriarchate was ignored. There were Latin patriarchs until 1291, nominally even until 1374. They resided in Ptolemais (Accon) until 1291, then in Cyprus. In 1847 Pius IX. named J. Valerga as patriarch (d. 1872), and at present there are in Jerusalem 4,000 Latin Catholics, besides several hundred "United" Catholics of different rites. There are also the patriarchates of the Melchites (united Greeks) and that of the Armenians. The Gregorian Armenians possess a patriarchate of Jerusalem, organized in the seventeenth century.

The Jacobites have a bishop and a small church in Jerusalem, and the Abyssinians also have a church. (F. KATTENBUSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The fundamental work is in Greek by Dositheus, a patriarch of Jerusalem (d. 1707), "On the Patriarchs in Jerusalem," ed. by his successor Chrysanthos, Bucharest, 1715. Consult further: M. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, iii. 101 sqq., Paris, 1740 (important); H. Guthe, in *ZDPV*, xii (1899), 81 sqq.; O. Werner, *Orbis terrarum Catholicus*, chap. xvii., Freiburg, 1890; Schlatter, in *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, ii. 3 (1898); E. Hampel, *Untersuchungen über das lateinische Patriarchat von Jerusalem*, Erlangen, 1899; Vailhé, in *Revue de l'orient*, 1899, pp. 44 sqq., 512 sqq., 1900, pp. 19 sqq.; A. Zagarelli, in *ZDPV*, xii (1899), 35 sqq.; T. Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Kanons*, vi. 281 sqq., Leipsic, 1900.

JERUSALEM, SYNOD OF, 1672: By far the most important of all the synods held in Jerusalem after the meeting of the apostles (Acts xv.; see APOSTOLIC COUNCIL). From the time of Cyril Lucar (q.v.), the Eastern Church had lain under the suspicion of Calvinistic tendencies, and not altogether without cause. But Cyril's violent death sealed the fate of the movement he had led. His successor, Cyril of Berrhoë, condemned his teaching at a synod in Constantinople in 1638, and so did his successor, Parthenius, four years later, in a synod at Jassy. Peter Mogilas, the Russian metropolitan of Kiev, put together a confession of faith in 1643, for which he obtained the sanction of Parthenius and of the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Moscow. Meantime the Roman Catholic and the Protestant parties in the West were trying to support their respective sides by adducing Eastern testimony, not always, if the Greeks are to be believed, quite accurately. Thus the French Calvinist preacher, Jean Claude, in his controversy on the Eucharist with Nicole and Arnauld, appealed to the older Eastern writers, whose teaching seemed to have been revived by Cyril and his adherents; the Jansenists, supported by the French court, to the orthodox profession of the Greeks. Nectarius (q.v.), patriarch of Jerusalem, published a book against Claude; and his successor Dositheus (q.v.) considered it necessary to take still more formal action, not without pressure from the French ambassador, Olivier de Nointel, who influenced him to call a synod at Jerusalem to refute these accusations of Calvinism. This synod was attended by most of the prominent representatives of the Eastern Church, including six metropolitans besides Dositheus and his retired predecessor, and its decrees received so universal a sanction as to make them more truly an expression of the faith of the Greek Church than any later synod could claim for its own. Its occasion is seen in the fact that the first part of its discussions is directed to the refutation of the "shameless" attempts of the Calvinists to support their teaching by Eastern authority. This part contains the acts of the councils of Constantinople and Jassy, and reviews the recent history with the purpose of showing the freedom of the patriarchate from error, while at the same time anathematizing the heretical writings and propositions which bore the name of a patriarch. The second part contains the declaration of orthodox faith which Dositheus, in the name of the assembled Fathers, set forth in opposition to the rejected tenets of Cyril. It follows them point by point, adhering as far as possible to their structure, but changing their substance into an orthodox content. It contains eighteen *decreta* and four *quaestiones*. The former deal with the Trinity; Holy Scripture and its exposition by the Church; predestination; the origin of evil, and the relation to it of divine providence; original sin; the incarnation; the mediatorial office of Christ and the saints; faith working by love; the Church, its episcopate, its membership, its infallibility; justification by faith and works; the capability of natural and regenerate man; the seven sacraments; infant baptism; the Eucharist; and the condition of the soul after death. The questions cover the canon of Scripture, whether it can be understood by all, the matter of images, and the cultus of the saints. Taken as a whole, the "Shield of Orthodoxy," as the entire pronouncement was entitled, is one of the most important expressions of the faith of the Eastern Church.

(Rudolf Hofmann.)

Bibliography: A good edition of the Acts is in Harduin, *Concilia*, xi. 179–272, and a critical edition in E. J. Kimmel, *Monumenta fidei ecclesiae occidentalis*, Jena, 1850; they are in English in *The Acts and Decrees . . . transl. from the Greek . . . containing the Confession . . . of Cyril Lukar, with Notes by J. N. W. B. Robertson*, London, 1899. Consult: W. Gass, *Symbolik der griechischen Kirche*, pp. 79 sqq., Berlin, 1872; F. Kattenbusch, *Vergleichende Konfessionskunde*, p. 145, Freiburg, 1890; *KL*, vi. 1359–1360.

JERUSALEM, yê-rū′zā-lem, **JOHANN FRIEDRICH WILHELM:** Apologist and theologian; b. at Osnabrück, Hanover, Nov. 22, 1709; d. at Wolfenbüttel (7 m. s. of Brunswick) Sept. 2, 1789. He began the study of theology at Leipsic in 1727, continued his studies in Leyden, and for a time preached in the German church of that city. He was appointed court preacher to Duke Charles of Brunswick in Wolfenbüttel and tutor of his son (1742); in the following year he became provost of the monasteries of the Holy Cross and St. Ægidius, in 1749 abbot of Marienthal, in 1752 abbot of Riddagshausen, and in 1771 vice-president of the consistory of Wolfenbüttel. He founded the Karolinum, an institution of learning in Brunswick, and organized the system of the poor laws. His most important work is *Betrachtungen über die vornehmsten Wahrheiten der Religion* (2 vols., Brunswick, 1768–79), which was translated into many languages and was still used in the beginning of the nineteenth century as a work on apologetics. Jerusalem took also a significant rank as preacher; two collections of his sermons appeared in Brunswick, 1745–53. His son, Karl Wilhelm Jerusalem, was the friend of Goethe who committed suicide at Wetzlar in 1772 and gave occasion for *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers*.

(A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: An autobiography was printed in his *Nachgelassene Schriften*, Brunswick, 1793. Consult J. M. H. Döring, *Die deutschen Kanzelredner des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts*, Neustadt, 1830; *ADB*, xiii. 779; *KL*, vi. 1365–1366.

JESSOPP, jes′əp, **AUGUSTUS:** Church of England; b. at Cheshunt (13 m. n. of London), Herts, Dec. 20, 1824. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1848), and was ordered deacon in 1848 and ordained priest in 1850. He was curate of Papworth St. Agnes, Cambridgeshire, in 1848–55, master of Helston Grammar School, Cornwall, in 1855–59, headmaster of King Edward VI.'s School, Norwich, in 1859–79, and has been rector of Scarning, Norfolk, since 1879. He has been honorary canon of Norwich, as well as honorary fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and of Worcester College, Oxford, since 1895, and chaplain in ordinary to the king since 1902. He was select preacher at Oxford in 1896, and has written or edited *Donne's Essays in Divinity* (London, 1855); *Norwich School Sermons* (1864); *Dissertations on the Fragments of Primitive Liturgies and Confessions of Faith contained in the Writings of the New Testament* (1871); *Letters of F. Henry Walpole, from the Original Manuscripts at Stonyhurst College* (Norwich, 1873); *One Generation of a Norfolk House: A Contribution to Elizabethan History* (London, 1876); *History of the Diocese of Norwich* (1884); *Autobiography of Roger North* (1887); *Arcady for Better for Worse* (1887); *The Coming of the Friars, and Other Historical Essays* (1888); *The Trials of a Country Parson* (1890); *Studies of a Recluse* (1892); *Random Roaming* (1893); *Simon Ryan the Peterite* (1896); *Frivola* (1896); *The Life and Miracles of St. William of Norwich, by Thomas of Monmouth* (in collaboration with M. R. James, Cambridge, 1896); *John Donne, Sometime Dean of St. Paul's* (1897); *Before the Great Pillage* (1901); and *William Cecil, Lord Burghley* (1904).

JESSUP, jes′ʊp, **HENRY HARRIS:** Presbyterian; b. at Montrose, Pa., Apr. 19, 1832. He was graduated at Yale in 1851 and Union Theological Seminary in 1855. In the latter year he went to Tripoli, Syria, under the auspices of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, remaining there until 1860, when he went to Beirut, where he has since remained. Since 1870 he has worked under the auspices of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, and has been professor of church history, theology, and homiletics in the Syrian Theological Seminary, Beirut. He was a member of the Turco-American commission on indemnities after the massacres of Oct., 1860–July, 1861. In theology he is Calvinistic according to the Revised Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church, and has written *Women of the Arabs* (New York, 1874); *Syrian Home Life* (1874); *The Mohammedan Missionary Problem* (Philadelphia, 1880); and *The Life of Kamil* (1894). He has in preparation *A History of the Syria Mission* (2 vols.).

JESUATE, jez′yu-êt: A religious order, originally called *Clerici apostolici Sancti Hieronymi*, founded at Sienna about 1360 by Giovanni Colombini, a wealthy merchant and senator. After living with his wife in continence for some time, he separated entirely from her and placed her in a convent, with his daughters, giving them a portion of his property. The rest he bestowed on the religious and poor and, with his friend Francesco Miani, lived in poverty, caring for the sick and preaching. Expelled from Sienna, he continued his work in Arezzo and elsewhere. In 1367, when Urban V. returned from Avignon to Rome, he was besought by Colombini and his followers to permit them to found an order and to assign them a habit; but this was refused for some months because of a suspicion that the Jesuates were connected with the heretical Fraticelli. This Colombini was able to disprove, and the order was confirmed. After the founder's death (July 31, 1367), Francesco Miani assumed control. The Jesuates devoted themselves chiefly to the care of the sick and to works of mercy, and consisted of lay brothers with minor vows. Their rule was originally a mixture of Benedictine and Franciscan elements, but later was changed to a somewhat modified Augustinian rule. In 1668 the order, which had already been reformed by Paul V. in 1606, became so worldly that it was suppressed by Clement IX. The female branch of the order, founded at Sienna by Caterina Colombini (d. 1387), a kinswoman of Giovanni Colombini, preserved the original vigor of its rule, and consequently survived the male Jesuates fully two centuries.

(O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: *Vita J. Columbini*, in *ASB*, July, viii. 354–398, and by G. Bonafide, Rome, 1642. Later working over of the material is given in the lives by F. Poesl, Regensburg, 1846; and Countess Rambuteau, Paris, 1889. Consult: Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, iii. 407 sqq.; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, ii. 240–242; *KL*, vi. 1371 sqq.

JESUITS.

I. Organization and Discipline of the Society.
  Qualifications of Candidates (§ 1).
  Analysis of the Constitutions (§ 2).
  "On the Virtue of Obedience" (§ 3).
  Rules and Other Manuals (§ 4).
II. History of the Society.
  Privileges and Exemptions (§ 1).
  Early Achievements in Italy, Portugal, and France (§ 2).
  In Germany and Austria (§ 3).
  In Belgium, Holland, and England (§ 4).
  Mission Work in America (§ 5).
  Unethical Teachings and Practises (§ 6).
  Internal Development and Moral Declension (§ 7).
  Decline and Proscription (§ 8).
  Illicit Continuance and Restoration (§ 9).
III. Female Orders in Imitation of Jesuits.

The Jesuits (*Societas Jesu*, "Company of Jesus") is "the most wide-spread of all the religious orders founded in modern times." For an account of the founding of the order see Ignatius of Loyola.

1. Qualifications of Candidates.

I. Organization and Discipline of the Society: The *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu cum earum declarationibus*, having been approved by Paul III., Julius III., and Paul IV., and commended after careful examination by the Council of Trent, was again emphatically approved and confirmed by Gregory XIII. (Feb., 1582) and printed in Rome in 1583. The text is accompanied by marginal declarations or explanatory notes printed in italics, with a full alphabetical index. The end of the society is declared to be the salvation and perfection of the souls of its members as well as of men in general. The ordinary vows of obedience, poverty, and chastity are required of all members, and that of poverty is explained so as to exclude absolutely not only individual but collective possessions. Receiving compensation for masses, sermons, lectures, or any sort of religious service, even in the form of alms, is absolutely prohibited (*Examen*, i. 3). An exception is made in the case of colleges and houses of probation with their buildings and revenues. *Scholars* take the three ordinary vows of poverty, obedience and celibacy and promise to enter the higher ranks of service if the glory of God should require it. *Coadjutors* or helpers, whether in spiritual or in temporal things, take only the same. Their promotion to the ranks of the Professed depends on their faithfulness and efficiency in the things committed to them. The *Professed*, or members of the inner circle, who possess the secrets of the order, and from whom the officers are chosen, take in addition to these vows a special vow to the pope, that they will journey without parleying and without asking for traveling expenses, whithersoever he may order, whether among believers or unbelievers. A fourth class is made up of those whose position in the order has not yet been determined, but who are in readiness to enter either grade that the superior may direct. A period of probation (novitiate) usually lasting for two years, in which the candidate is trained in obedience and thoroughly tested as regards aptitude, mental, physical, moral, and spiritual, for the purposes of the order, precedes entrance into any of the grades mentioned (*Examen*, i. 12). Inquiry is to be made of each candidate whether he has ever been separated from the Church by reason of denial of the faith or falling into errors or into schism; whether he has perpetrated homicide or become infamous on account of enormous sins; whether he has belonged to another order; whether he has been bound by the chain of matrimony or servitude; whether he is afflicted with poor judgment. Affirmative answers to these questions disqualify for admission (*Examen*, ii.). Careful inquiry is further to be made respecting name, age, birth-place, legitimacy of birth, religious character of ancestors, names, occupations, and worldly condition of parents (similar inquiries about brothers and sisters); whether he is under obligation to marry, whether he has any son, whether he is in debt or has civil liabilities, whether he has a trade and can read and write, whether he has any disease, has received ecclesiastical ordination, or is under a vow; what have been his habits of religious devotion, reading, and meditation; whether he entertains any religious opinions different from those of the Church, whether he is ready to leave the world and to follow the counsels of our Lord Jesus Christ, whether he fully purposes to live and die in the society; and when, where, and by whom was he first moved to take this position. The answers expected to these inquiries are manifest (ibid. iii.). The candidate is required to relinquish his possessions, if not immediately, at latest after one year. Intercourse with relatives is restricted and practically prohibited. He must agree to have all his defects and errors pointed out to him. He must submit to training in the "Spiritual Exercises," and spend a month doing menial work in a hospice and another month in traveling as a mendicant. For the rest of the two years of probation many other tests are applied, the aim being to make the candidate as a "corpse or a staff" in the hands of his superior. The candidate must express a willingness to become a secular coadjutor or whatever his superiors may determine to be for the greater glory of God and to be willing in all things to submit his own feeling and judgment to that of the society (ibid. v.). For coadjutors and scholars a still further testing of absolute obedience and requisite efficiency is provided (ibid. vi.–viii.).

The body of the work consists of eight books. Part I. treats of "Admission to Probation." To the general belongs the final decision as to whether an applicant shall be accepted or rejected. The qualities sought in those to be admitted are given in detail: good appearance, health, youth, physical

2. Analysis of the Constitution.

strength and endurance, sound doctrine or aptitude for learning it, discretion in doing things or good judgment for acquiring it, good memory, avidity for all virtue and spiritual perfection, quietness, constancy, strenuosity in service, zeal for the salvation of souls, gracefulness of speech, honorable appearance, nobility, wealth, good reputation (these last not necessary, but highly desirable). Detailed directions are given (Part I.) concerning the manner of admitting those who seem to have in sufficient measure the qualities desired. Part II. pertains to dismissing those who have been received on probation and have proved unfit. The main thing here is to satisfy the person to be dismissed that no injustice is done him, but that the greater glory of God requires his dismission, and so to retain his friendship, and to satisfy the rest of the household that he has not been arbitrarily dealt with. Part III. treats of the training and promoting of those who remain in probation. The cultivation of all the mental, moral, and spiritual elements that are considered desirable, especially of prompt and cheerful obedience and deep interest in the purposes of the society, and such hygienic living as will conserve and increase the physical fitness of the probationer, are described in detail. No stress is laid upon asceticism, perfect physical condition being the thing sought. Part IV. treats of the education of the members and education as a means of influence upon those that are without. Conditions of admission, discipline, and curricula, with prescribed texts, in theology and in liberal arts, science, and philosophy are somewhat minutely given. Public schools to be open to non-Jesuits are to be conducted in connection with the colleges. Universities are to be established under the auspices of the society; but it is not thought wise for the society to burden itself with faculties of law or medicine. The ultimate aim of all educational effort was evidently to gain an absolute mastery over the pupil and the devotion of his powers to the purposes of the society. Part V. treats of the things that pertain to admission into the body of the society, that is, into the rank of the "professed." The right of admitting belongs to the general, but he may delegate it to subordinates when he thinks it expedient to do so. Only those are to be admitted into the inner circle who have manifested the possession in a high degree of the gifts and graces, the acquisitions, the enthusiasm, the efficiency, the absolute devotion to the interests of the order that the system was designed and adapted to produce. Out of this body come the officials, including the general. Part VI. deals with the demeanor and duties of the professed. The utmost stress is laid upon obedience and the scrupulous execution of the constitution and rules of the society. They must love poverty as the strong wall of religion and preserve it in its purity. Part VII. treats of the things that pertain to the distribution of the professed throughout the Lord's vineyard for the good of mankind (*proximorum*). Their obligation to go without questioning wherever the pope or the general may direct and to devote themselves unsparingly to the accomplishment of whatever tasks may be assigned is much emphasized. Part VIII. deals with methods to be employed in keeping the parts of the organization in close touch with the head and with each other. The utmost importance is attached to the vital unity of the body, and frequent and full correspondence with the head and among those charged with various enterprises is insisted upon. Provision is also made for general congregations for the discussion and settlement of important matters. It is thought to be in the interest of unity that the general reside in Rome, where he can always be reached, and that each provincial reside continuously at the point determined upon in his province. In case of the death or retirement of the general, a general congregation is to be called for the election of his successor, and detailed directions are given for the election. The general is expected to appoint a vicar to assist him and to summon the general congregation in case of his demise. Part IX. deals with the functions and authority of the general and of the authority and watch-care of the society over the general. The society controls the expenses and manner of living of the general. He is subject to constant watching, to admonition, and to deposition in case his conduct or teaching should warrant it. He must confess regularly to a properly authorized confessor. The provincials are to lead in proceedings against the general. Part X. (and last) treats of the manner in which the whole body of the society may be conserved and increased in its good estate. The vow taken by the professed closes the work. He promises that he will never consent to a change of the ordinances concerning poverty, "unless at any time from just cause of exigent affairs it seems that poverty ought rather to be restricted," that he will never directly or indirectly put forth effort to secure his own election or promotion to any office or dignity in the society, that he will never seek or consent to be elected to any office or dignity outside of the society unless compelled by obedience to higher authority, that he will report on any brother that he knows to be seeking office or promotion, that if he should accept an ecclesiastical position he would have constant regard to the obedience due to the general.

For "The Spiritual Exercises," see EXERCITIA SPIRITUALIA.

3. "On the Virtue of Obedience."

Ignatius' tract "On the Virtue of Obedience" stands side by side with the Spiritual Exercises and the Constitution as one of the foundation books of the society. It is a letter of less than 4,000 words addressed in April, 1553, to "the brethren of the Society of Jesus who are in Lusitania." He wishes his brethren, while being perfect in all spiritual gifts and ornaments, to be preeminent in the virtue of obedience:

> "The only virtue that inserts the other virtues in the mind and guards those that have been inserted. While this flourishes, beyond doubt the rest will flourish. . . . Our salvation was wrought by Him who 'became obedient unto death.' . . . We may the more easily suffer ourselves to be surpassed by other religious orders in fastings, vigils, and other asperity of food and clothing, which each by its own ritual and discipline holily receives: I could wish, dearest brethren, that you who serve our Lord Jesus Christ in this society should be conspicuous indeed in true and perfect obedience and abdication of will and especially of judgment;

> and for the true and germane progeny of this same society to be distinguished as it were by this note, that they never look upon the person himself whom they obey, but in him look upon Christ the Lord for whose sake they obey. Even if the superior be ornamented and furnished with prudence, goodness, and whatever other gifts, he is not to be obeyed on account of these things, but solely because he is God's vicegerent by whose authority he performs his functions, who says 'he that heareth you heareth me,' 'he that despiseth you despiseth me': nor, on the contrary, even if the superior should be somewhat deficient in counsel or prudence, ought there to be any remission of obedience on that account, so long as he is one's superior; since it has reference to the person of Him whose wisdom can not be deceived: and He will supply whatever may be wanting to his minister, whether he be lacking in probity or in other ornaments—seeing that when Christ had said in express words 'The Scribes and Pharisees sit on Moses' seat,' he straightway added 'All things therefore whatsoever they have said to you, observe and do, but refuse to do according to their works.'"

He proceeds to show that mere outward obedience to a superior, with inner disapproval of the command, is the "lowest and utterly imperfect form of obedience, not worthy of the name of virtue unless it ascends to another grade, which makes one's own the will of the superior and so agrees with it that not only the execution appears in the effect, but also the consent in the affection, and so both will the same thing and disapprove the same thing." Obedience is declared to be "the sacrifice of one's own will, which is the highest part of the mind," the highest possible offering we can make to God. He warns his readers never to attempt to bend the will of a superior to their own. This would be not to conform your will to the divine, but to wish to regulate the divine will by the standard of your own. As a third degree of obedience, which he would have his readers attain, he urges that they should not only will the same, but also think the same as the superior; they should subject their judgment to his. The devout will is able to sway the intelligence, so that "whatever things the superior commands and thinks may seem to the inferior right and true." The best way to accomplish this "holocaust" so essential to personal peace and tranquillity, alacrity, and diligence, and to the unity and efficiency of the society, is "not to look upon the person of the superior as a man obnoxious to errors and miseries, but as Christ himself, who is the highest wisdom, immeasurable goodness, infinite love, who can neither be deceived nor does he wish to deceive you; and since you are conscious within yourselves that by the love of God you have subjected yourselves to the yoke of obedience, that in following the will of the superior you follow more certainly the divine will, do not allow yourselves to doubt that the most faithful love of the Lord will go on by his own ministry which he has appointed over you to govern you from step to step and lead you in right ways. Therefore the voice of your superior and his orders receive not otherwise than as the voice of Christ." On Jan. 1, 1604, Acquaviva, general of the society, prescribed the reading of this tract by every member of the society every two days. It is appended to the *Regulae Societatis Jesu* in the edition published in Rome in 1616 and frequently afterward.

4. Rules and Other Manuals.

Early in the history of the society a body of rules was printed for the guidance of members in private and in public life. The edition of 1616, published in Rome by Bernardus de Angelis, secretary of the society, embraces additions made by the Seventh General Congregation. It begins with a summary of the Constitution. "Common rules" to be observed by all regarding general deportment, religious exercises, reading, etc., follow. Next come the "Rules of the Provincial," the responsible leader in a province, and his assistants; those of the provost of the house of the professed; those of the college rector; those of the examiner who has to pass upon the qualifications of candidates for admission into the society; those of the master of the novices (with a list of ascetical books suitable for his use); instruction for rendering an account of one's conscience, comprising fourteen questions to be answered in confession and intended to cover all experiences of soul for six months (a year in case of the professed) follows. Rules for those who go on pilgrimages, for assistants of provosts and rectors, consultors (experts without office available for the settlement of difficulties that may arise in any institution of the society), the monitor (whose function is to admonish superiors and report to consultors, to collect the letters of consultors and send them to superiors, etc.). A formula for writing letters by superiors to provincials and by provincials to the general, and directions for the preparation of the annual catalogue of each institution with full information about each member, follow. Rules for prefects, priests, preachers, proctors, librarians, sextons, those who have the care of the sick, etc., are also given.

The *Institutum Societatis Jesus* (Rome, 1606, Lyons, 1607) and the *Corpus Institutionum S. J.* (Antwerp, 1709) include a collection of the works already mentioned, with the "Decrees and Canons of the General Congregations," the "Ordinances of the Generals," and some ascetical works.

In 1614 there was published at Cracow what purported to be the secret instructions given to members of the society as to the means to be used to acquire influence over the rich and the noble and to get the advantage of members of other orders and of secular priests in the confessional and other kinds of service. It abounds in worldly-wise advice and recommends the use of all kinds of chicanery for the enrichment and aggrandizement of the society. It consists of seventeen short chapters. It has been frequently reprinted and translated into many languages, thus becoming widely circulated. It seems highly probable that Hieronymus Zahorowski, who had recently severed his connection with the society, published the book with the cooperation of Count George Zbaraski and other Polish enemies of the order. The repudiation of the work by the society is no conclusive evidence of its spuriousness. It has been its policy from the beginning to deny all discreditable reports and to take the chances of being proved unveracious. If the *Monita Secreta* was really written by Jesuit officials, it is probable that it was never printed by them and that copies in manuscript were very closely guarded before and especially after the publication of 1614. On the other hand, there is no conclusive proof of the genuineness of the work. It embodies in true

Jesuit style what was believed to be the actual practise of members, and if it be formally a fabrication, it was written by one who was thoroughly conversant with the society's literature, modes of thought, and practise at that time. There is nothing in the work that is more cynical or immoral than much that is found in acknowledged Jesuit writings.

1. Privileges and Exemptions.

II. History of the Society: The popes from Paul III. to Urban VIII. bestowed one after another almost every imaginable privilege and exemption upon the society, including the performing of religious services of all kinds without regard to the rights of the clergy and of other orders and even when an interdict is in force. Nothing seems to have been omitted that would add to their influence and authority (cf. *Litterae apostolicae, quibus institutio, confirmatio, et varia privilegia continentur Societatis Jesu*, Antwerp, 1635, and often, with later documents, and *Compendium privilegiorum et gratiarum Societatis Jesu*, Antwerp, 1635). These privileges and exemptions covered nearly all cases ordinarily reserved to the popes and all cases ordinarily reserved to the bishop, ordination, unction, chrism, adjuration, exorcism, confirmation, distribution of indulgences, granting divorces, baptizing bells, making new statutes, dispensing from fasts and prohibited foods for members of the order and others, neglecting canonical hours for worship and masses, and acting as advocates, judges, and guardians in all sorts of cases, criminal, civil, or mixed. Gregory XIII. ordered that all refusing to assist them in work of this kind be excommunicated. He expressly commanded archbishops, bishops, and other clergy to assist the Jesuits laboring within their jurisdiction with their power and resources and never to permit them to be impeded, molested, expelled, or deprived of their possessions. In 1575 he appointed Jesuits as pontifical librarians and charged them with the censorship of books. Armed with such privileges, and with the resources of the whole papal church at their command, it is no wonder that they multiplied in numbers and planted their institutions of learning and their religious houses throughout the world; nor that they became arrogant and oppressive. That they should have incurred the jealousy and hatred of the other religious orders, of the secular clergy, and of the prelates, and that they should have struck terror to the hearts of Protestants in regions exposed to their ravages, might have been expected. A learned Roman Catholic writer (Caspar Scioppius [?] in his *Anatomia Societatis Jesu*, n.p., 1668) charges them with attempting to establish for themselves a monopoly of things of the greatest necessity and dignity:

> "Of grace with God, that nobody may be able to be in God's grace nor to obtain indulgence or absolution of sins save through the Jesuits; of grace with princes and magnates, that no one may be able to obtain honors, offices or wealth from them, save through the Jesuits; of the Catholic faith, that no one may be able from being a pagan to become a Christian or from being a heretic to become a Catholic, save by the work of the Jesuits; of perfection, that no one may be able to be perfect or holy, save through the Jesuits, i.e., unless he be received into their society; of learning, that no one may be able to learn divine and human letters, unless he avail himself of Jesuit masters; of virtue or good morals, that no one may become well moralized, save through the admonitory examples of the Jesuits; of reputation or good name, that no one may be esteemed good or learned, save by their votes, or at least with the suffrance of the Jesuits" (p. 11; for several other classified and tabulated statements against the society cf. pp. 9–23).

2. Early Achievements in Italy, Portugal, and France.

Having approved of the constitution of the society and conferred upon it extensive privileges, Paul III. proceeded at once to employ its members in the most difficult and responsible undertakings. In fact his eagerness to send his associates on missions was embarrassing to the founder, who feared that such prominent service would interfere with the maintenance of obedience, humility, and poverty that he thought essential. They soon came into sharp rivalry with the Dominicans, the recognized leaders in philosophy and theology, and formerly the promoters and executive officers of the Inquisition (see DOMINIC, SAINT, AND THE DOMINICAN ORDER). In the Council of Trent, especially the later sessions, they were the confidential spokesmen of the papal teaching and policy and took a leading part in the revival and the establishment of the Inquisition wherever it was practicable. In Italy the influence of the society soon became paramount. The Collegium Romanum, endowed with special privileges and most generously supported by the pope and his friends, carried on the educational work of the society with the greatest enthusiasm and success (1550 onward). Side by side with this the Collegium Germanicum was established by Gregory XIII. (1753) for the education of those who were to carry forward the Counter-Reformation in German-speaking countries. It was the policy of the pope and of the Jesuit administration to fill this college with students of noble birth, though it was not found practicable to make the restriction absolute. About the middle of the seventeenth century the nobles were in the majority (cf. documents cited by Reusch in *ZKG*, xiii. 269–270, 1892). The king of Portugal invited Francis Xavier (q.v.) and Simon Rodriguez d'Azendo, two of Ignatius' earliest and most zealous associates, to his court and committed himself to the fullest cooperation with the society. Rodriguez became his chief counselor and Xavier went on his great mission to India and China under the king's patronage. The Jesuits were soon in control of the college at Coimbra, and until a reaction occurred in 1578 they virtually ruled the state. In Spain their conquest was less rapid and complete. They were opposed to the policy of conciliation in relation to Protestantism that had been adopted by Charles V. The Dominicans, who had gained great prestige in Spain because of their leadership in the drastic measures against Mohammedans and Jews as well as against nascent Protestantism, bitterly opposed the society, partly because of its early manifestation of Pelagian tendencies. Melchior Cano (q.v.) denounced the Jesuits as the forerunners of Antichrist (II Tim. iii. 2). Philip II., though in accord with their uncompromising hostility to Protestantism and influenced to some extent by them, never surrendered himself completely to their domination. The winning of Francis of Borgia (q.v.), duke of Gandia, who had been a courtier of Charles V., and had been employed in important administrative offices, to membership (1548) was no doubt the most important addition to the personnel of the society since it received papal recognition. He was to prove one of the ablest and most enthusiastic workers and to become the third general (July 2, 1565). The universities of Alcala and Salamanca resisted strenuously the efforts of the Jesuits to gain control; but they finally succeeded in establishing themselves in these centers of influence. Further progress was less difficult. The society encountered antipathy and mistrust in France. A number of youths sent by Ignatius to the University of Paris in 1540 were driven away. The archbishop of Paris, the parliament of Paris, and the Sorbonne united their forces in opposition to the aggressions of the body. The cardinal of Lorraine supported the society. The Jesuits did not succeed until 1661 in establishing a college in France, and this (Clermont) was long denied university privileges. The Jesuits Auger and Pelletian preached and labored with such efficiency in Lyons (1559) as to cause an uprising against the Huguenots that resulted in the burning of their books, the banishment of their preachers, and the suppression of their worship. A Jesuit college was established there in commemoration of their triumph. They persistently opposed Henry of Navarre in his struggle for the crown, refused to pray for him after his submission to the pope, and denounced the Edict of Nantes. Henry did everything in his power to conciliate them, recalled a decree of banishment that had been issued against them, made a Jesuit his confessor, and sought to use the Jesuits in defending himself against Spain, where the Dominicans were highly influential. He was not content with giving to the Jesuits a foremost place in France, but he sought to secure their restoration to Venice, whence they had been expelled in 1606, and to extend the sphere of their influence in other lands. He eagerly promoted the canonization of Ignatius Loyola and Francis Xavier (1608). Yet he was distrusted by the society and when, as he was on the point of marching an army against the emperor and his allies, he was assassinated by François Ravaillac, the Huguenots charged that Jesuit influence had compassed his death, though direct instigation could not be proved. After the death of Henry IV. the society became still more powerful in France, and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (q.v.) and the destruction of the Huguenots (q.v.) were largely due to their persistent efforts. The Jansenists asserted that their theology was Pelagian and that their morals were lax (q.v.; see also ARNAULD; DU VERGIER DE HAURANNE, JEAN; PASCAL, BLAISE; PORT ROYAL; QUESNEL, PASQUIER).

3. In Germany and Austria.

Germany and Austria were the scenes of their greatest triumphs. The first Jesuit to enter Germany was Lefèvre, who, in 1640, accompanied Ortiz, deputy of Charles V., to the Diet of Worms. In the city of Worms he found only one priest that was not a concubinary or polluted with crime, so with a zeal rarely surpassed he undertook to rally the demoralized Catholic forces and to inspire with love for Romanism and hatred for Protestantism the few priests and laymen that were amenable to his influence. He participated in the Diet of Regensburg (Apr., 1641), at which Butzer and Melanchthon represented the Evangelical interests. Deeply lamenting the lack of zeal and efficiency in the Catholics present, he invited bishops, prelates, electors, ambassadors, vicars-general, theologians, and others to his courses in training in the Spiritual Exercises. He was made the confessor of the son of the duke of Savoy. Germans, Portuguese, Spanish, and Italians eagerly sought his spiritual guidance. He extended his efforts to Nuremberg. Having been ordered by the general to Portugal, his place was taken by LeJay, whose chief work was to train the priests for aggressive work against heresy and to inspire the nobles with the conviction that heresy must be exterminated at whatever cost. He was soon reinforced by Bobadilla, who in 1541 had achieved a great success in the diocese of Viterbo, had formed an intimate acquaintance at Innsbruck with Ferdinand I., king of the Romans, won him to the Jesuit way of thinking, and accompanied him to Vienna, and had supported the Catholic cause in a number of diets. A college was established in Vienna, which soon became affiliated with the university. LeJay succeeded in filling with enthusiastic zeal against Protestantism many priests who had been idle and indifferent and in enlisting many nobles in the coercive and educational measures proposed by the society. Lefèvre returned to Germany in 1642 and made his influence powerfully felt in Speyer, Mainz, Brandenburg, and other places. Peter Canisius (q.v.) was even more important than Lefèvre or LeJay in organizing Jesuit work in Germany and in establishing training-schools for the propagation of Jesuit principles. From 1559 onward Munich was the chief Jesuit center, and came to be known as the "German Rome"; and the college established there attracted many noble Protestant youths, who were won over by their instructors. All the chief cities of Germany where Catholics had retained the ascendency and many where Protestantism had made great headway felt the influence of these enthusiastic and dauntless missionaries. Under their guidance Albert V. of Bavaria gave his Protestant subjects the choice of becoming Catholics or leaving the country. With their help Baden was cleared of Protestants in two years (1570–71). Similar measures were carried out in the territory of the abbot of Fulda, in Cologne, Münster, Hildesheim, Paderborn, and Würzburg. In 1595 the bishopric of Bamberg was cleared of heretics, and about 1602 the work was completed in the archbishopric of Mainz. From 1578 onward Jesuits led in the work of exterminating Protestantism in the Austrian provinces. The Counter-Reformation had largely accomplished its work in Austria and its dependencies before the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War (1618; q.v.). It was rapidly pressed to completion from this time onward. For the details of Jesuit activity in the Counter-Reformation and in the revived Inquisition, see COUNTER-REFORMATION and articles there referred to; also INQUISITION.

4. In Belgium, Holland, and England.

From 1542 onward the Jesuits had been active in Belgium. They were expelled from the country during the early years of the war with Spain, but were readmitted, under the patronage of Alexander Farnese, after Spanish authority had been reestablished, and were protected by Philip II., who had formerly opposed them (1581–1584). Within a few years they had almost taken possession of the land and made it the base of successful propagandism in the Protestant Netherlands. By 1692 twenty-two Jesuits and 220 secular priests, most of whom had been educated in their colleges, were working in the United Netherlands, and the Catholic membership had increased from a few thousand scattered and discouraged souls to 345,000. The assassination of William of Orange (1584) was commonly attributed to Jesuit influence on the ground that, as was asserted, Balthasar Gerard claimed the blessing of the rector of the Jesuit college at Treves before committing the crime.

The Jesuits early addressed themselves to the task of reestablishing papal supremacy in England. In 1542 Paschasius Brouet and Alphonso Salmeron (q.v.) made a secret and rapid tour through Ireland, and in thirty-four days succeeded in inflaming the Catholics of Ireland against the government of Henry VIII. and against Protestantism. But the Jesuits met with little success in Scotland. In England they carried on for more than a century a secret but effective propaganda. In 1569 William Allen (q.v.), afterward a cardinal, established at Douai (q.v.) a training-school for Jesuit missionaries to England, where a large number of British Catholic youths were prepared for the extremely perilous work of restoring papal authority in Britain. Sacked by the Protestants of Flanders at the instigation of the English government, the college was reopened at Reims under the patronage of the archbishop, and continued to train men for English work and martyrdom. In 1579 an English college was opened in Rome for the same purpose. The most active leaders of the Jesuit work in England were Robert Parsons and Edmund Campian (qq.v.). In Scotland Jesuits attached themselves to the court of Mary Stuart (c. 1587), and by encouraging her aspirations after the English crown wrought her destruction. The "Gunpowder Plot" (1605) was commonly attributed to their machinations.

5. Mission Work in America.

The missionary efforts of the Jesuits, under French patronage, in North America among the Indians (see Indians of North America, Missions to; Missions to the Heathen, A) and the French colonists were from their own point of view highly successful. In Florida, Mexico, South America and Central America, and California they established their great mission compounds where captured natives, sometimes guarded and forced by Spanish and Portuguese troops, were employed as laborers and compelled to conform to Roman Catholic observances. Their work among the North American Indians, as well as among the natives of India, China, and Japan, displayed heroic self-sacrifice of the highest order along with a willingness to receive a very superficial knowledge of Christianity as evidence of its acceptance. Those whom they baptized, even clandestinely, they claimed as members of the Christian Church.

6. Unethical Teachings and Practises.

Attention has already been called to the obligation of absolute and unquestioning obedience inculcated by Ignatius that involved the suppression or destruction of the individual conscience. The doctrine of Probabilism (q.v.) was not originated by the Jesuits, but was wrought out by their writers during the seventeenth century with more minuteness than by earlier Roman Catholic writers. According to this teaching one is at liberty to follow a probable opinion, i.e., one that has two or three reputable Catholic writers in its favor, against a more probable or a highly probable opinion in whose favor a multitude of the highest authorities concur. To justify any practise, however immoral it might be commonly esteemed, a few sentences from Catholic writers sufficed, and these were often garbled. Some Jesuits and some popes repudiated this doctrine. In 1680 Gonzales, an opponent of the doctrine, was made general of the society through papal pressure; but he failed to purge the society of probabilism and came near being deposed by reason of his opposition. Another antiethical device widely approved and employed by members of the society is Mental Reservation or Restriction (see Reservation, Mental), in accordance with which, when important interests are at stake, a negative or a modifying clause may remain unuttered which would completely reverse the statement actually made. This principle justified unlimited lying when one's interests or convenience seemed to require. Where the same word or phrase has more than one sense, it may be employed in an unusual sense with the expectation that it will be understood in the usual (amphibology). Such evasions may be used under oath in a civil court. Equally destructive of good morals was the teaching of many Jesuit casuists that moral obligation may be evaded by directing the intention when committing an immoral act to an end worthy in itself; as in murder, to the vindication of one's honor; in theft, to the supplying of one's needs or those of the poor; in fornication or adultery, to the maintenance of one's health or comfort. Nothing did more to bring upon the society the fear and distrust of the nations and of individuals than the justification and recommendation by several of their writers of the assassination of tyrants, the term "tyrant" being made to include all persons in authority who oppose the work of the papal church or the order. The question has been much discussed, Jesuits always taking the negative side, whether the Jesuits have taught that "the end sanctifies the means." It may not be possible to find this maxim in these precise words in Jesuit writings; but that they have always taught that for the "greater glory of God," identified by them with the extension of Roman Catholic (Jesuit) influence, the principles of ordinary morality may be set aside, seems certain. The doctrine of philosophical sin, in accordance with which actual attention to the sinfulness of an act when it is being committed is requisite to its sinfulness for the person committing it, was widely advocated by members of the society. The repudiation of some of the most scandalous maxims of Jesuit writers by later writers, or the placing of books containing scandalous maxims on the Index, does not relieve the society or the Roman Catholic Church from responsibility, as such books must have received authoritative approval before publication, and the censuring of them does not necessarily involve an adverse attitude toward the teaching itself, but may be a mere measure of expediency.

7. Internal Development and Moral Declension.

Lainez, who succeeded Ignatius in the office of general (1558–65), manifested in the administration of the affairs of the society more of worldly wisdom and less of pietistic enthusiasm than the founder. Paul IV. became alarmed at the remarkable growth and aggressiveness of the society. He sought (1558) to curb the almost irresponsible power of the generals by limiting their tenure of office to three years, and to limit the freedom of the body by requiring the observance of the canonical hours for singing in the choir. These changes would have placed the society on somewhat the same basis as the other orders and would have stripped it of half its power. These measures were earnestly resisted and the death of the pope (1559) prevented the calamity. Pius IV. let Lainez have his ambitious and aggressive way and employed his services in the later sessions of the Council of Trent. Francis of Borgia had spent his fortune in founding a college in Gandia and the Collegium Romanum and came to the office of general (1565) with all of the ascetical enthusiasm of Ignatius, but with little of his worldly wisdom. He was succeeded in 1572 by Mercurian, whose administration was relatively feeble. The greatest of all the generals was Claudius Acquaviva (1581–1615), a Neapolitan. He had to contend with a powerful and determined Spanish faction in the society that resented Italian control. The Spanish Jesuits secured the support of the Inquisition, of Philip II., and of Clement VIII. The latter summoned a General Congregation (1592) to deal with the difficulties. Acquaviva managed the meeting with such adroitness that he was triumphantly vindicated and thoroughly established in his office. Molina's Pelagian teaching provoked a fresh Dominican onslaught on the society. Acquaviva and his supporters espoused the cause of Molina (q.v.), though he had been condemned by the Spanish Inquisition. The pope transferred the dispute to Rome (1596) and for a time it looked as if the Dominicans would triumph; but Acquaviva's consummate skill again averted calamity. At the General Congregation he confounded his opponents by springing upon the assembly the news that Henry IV. of France had espoused his cause. Under Acquaviva the Counter-Reformation was carried forward with astonishing success. The failure of Dominicans, Inquisition, and pope to silence the Pelagian anthropology of the order encouraged its members to go to the greatest extremes in their moral theology. Under the administration of Mutius Vitelleschi (1615–45) the Counter-Reformation was carried almost to its completion and the Thirty Years' War almost ran its course. In 1640 the jubilee of the society was celebrated with great éclat. It now numbered 15,000 members distributed into thirty-nine provinces. The ascetical requirements of Ignatius had been put aside. The professed had increased in numbers in far greater proportion than the membership, and now freely accepted positions of honor and influence, enjoyed regular incomes, and lived like gentlemen, leaving the drudgery of the educational and church work to younger and less experienced men. They constituted a sort of aristocracy that neutralized to some extent the autocracy of the General. Degeneration continued unimpeded under Caraffa (d. 1649) and Piccolomini (d. 1651). The German Nickel (1651–64) proved so unsatisfactory as general that Oliva was made his vicar (1661). Oliva was a favorite of the pope and lived in splendor. His independent administration (1664–81) was favorable to the development of the worst features of Jesuitism. He was an advocate and promoter of Probabilism and other immoral forms of teaching and encouraged to the utmost the disposition to meddle with national and international politics that had become characteristic of the society. Ignatius had opposed with all his might the promotion of Jesuits to high ecclesiastical positions. In 1593 Tolet was made a cardinal; in 1599, Bellarmine; in 1629, Pazmany; in 1643, De Lugo, and many afterward. Their literary activity in all religious and secular branches of learning was very great during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The same may be said of the more recent time.

8. Decline and Proscription.

The growing secularization of the society and its need of vast resources for the maintenance and extension of its world-wide work and the diminution of free-will offerings that had sufficed in the times when religious enthusiasm was at its height led the society to engage in great speculative business enterprises, those conducted in Paraguay and Martinique resulting in disaster to many innocent investors (1753 onward), and brought upon the society much reproach in Portugal and France. In Portugal the Marquis of Pombal, one of the foremost statesmen of his time, became convinced that the liberation of the country from ecclesiastical rule, in which Jesuits had long been predominant, required the exclusion of the latter. An insurrection in Portuguese Paraguay by the natives furnished an occasion to Pombal for denouncing the Jesuits to the king and for demanding papal prohibition of their commercial undertakings. The papal prohibition was issued in 1758 and priestly privileges were withdrawn from Jesuits in Portugal. An attempt upon the life of the king (Sept. 3, 1758) was attributed to Jesuit influence and led to a decree for the expulsion of the society and the confiscation of its property (Sept. 3, 1759). The pope tried in vain to protect them and his nuncio was driven from the country. Malgrida, a Jesuit, was burned at the stake in 1761. Speculations by Jesuits in Martinique, in which vast sums of money were lost by French citizens, led to a public investigation of the methods of the society. and on April 16. 1761. the Parliament of Paris decreed a suppression of Jesuit establishments in France and on May 8 declared the entire order responsible for the debts of the principal promoter of the collapsed enterprise. Other parliaments followed that of Paris. King, pope, and many bishops protested in vain. Eighty of their colleges were closed in April, 1762. Their constitution was denounced as godless, sacrilegious, and treasonable, and the vows taken by Jesuits were declared to be null and void. On Nov. 26, 1764, the king agreed to a decree of expulsion. In Spain 6,000 Jesuits were suddenly arrested at night and conveyed to papal territory (Sept. 2–3, 1768). Refused admission by the pope, they took refuge in Corsica. A similar seizure and transportation of 3,000 had occurred at Naples (Nov. 3–4, 1767). Parma dealt with them similarly (Feb. 7, 1768), and soon afterward they were expelled from Malta by the Knights of St. John. The Bourbon princes urged Clement XIII. to abolish the society. He refused, and when he died (Feb. 2, 1769) there was much intriguing among friends and enemies of the Jesuits in seeking to secure the election of a pope that would protect or abolish the society. Cardinal Ganganelli was elected and it is highly probable that he had bargained with the Bourbons for the destruction of the Jesuits. From the beginning of his pontificate powerful pressure was brought to bear upon him by Spain, France, and Portugal for the abolition of the order. He gave promises of early action, but long hesitated to strike the fatal blow. He began by subjecting the Jesuit colleges in and around Rome to investigation. These were promptly suppressed and their inmates banished. Maria Theresa of Austria, who had been greatly devoted to the Jesuits, now regretfully abandoned them and joined with the Bourbons in demanding the abolition of the society by the pope. This combined pressure of the chief Catholic powers was more than the pope could withstand ("*Coactus feci*," he is reported to have afterward said). On July 21, 1773, he signed the Brief *Dominus ac Redemptor noster*, which abolished the society, and on August 16 the general and his chief assistants were imprisoned and all their property in Rome and the States of the Church confiscated (Eng. transl. of this brief is most easily accessible in Nicolini, *Hist. of the Jesuits*, pp. 387–406, London, 1893). The brief recites at length the charges of immoral teaching and intolerable meddlesomeness in matters of church and state, of the abuse of the unlimited privileges that the society has enjoyed, and virtually admits that it has become totally depraved and a universal nuisance. To restore peace to Christendom its abolition is declared to be necessary. A papal coin was struck the same year in commemoration of the event, with Christ sitting in judgment and saying to the Jesuit fathers arraigned on his left, "Depart from me all of you, I never knew you."

9. Illicit Continuance and Restoration.

At the time of its abolition the society had about 22,000 members. It would have been unreasonable to expect that so large a body of trained men, adepts at secret and evasive methods of work, and with centuries of successful effort behind them, would suddenly vanish in response to a papal brief extorted by the Roman Catholic powers. Thousands of them, without change of principles, became members of societies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus; others of the society of Fathers of the Faith, founded by Nicolo Paccanari (q.v.); others became Redemptorists or Liguorists (see LIGUORI, ALFONSO MARIA DE). Frederick II. of Prussia encouraged and protected them with a view, no doubt, to using their political knowledge and skill against the Bourbons, the Hapsburgers, and the pope. Catharine II. of Russia hoped by showing them favor to conciliate her new Polish subjects and to use them against Bourbons and Hapsburgers. In Naples and in France the papal decree was only imperfectly executed. Pius VI. gave full papal approval (1783) to the perpetuation of the society in Russia, while Pius VII. (1801) approved of their designating their vicar-general as general. The same pope approved of the restoration of the society in Naples and Sicily (July, 1804) so that the head of the society now became "General for Russia and Naples." The Napoleonic disturbance of Europe having come to an end and Pius VII. having been released from his French captivity, the need of the society for leadership in an aggressive movement for the restoration of the Roman Catholic Church to its former power was profoundly felt by the Curia. On Aug. 7, 1814, Pius VII. issued the bull *Solicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*, by which he restored the society. Since that time it has suffered many reverses and much persecution. Most of the states of Europe have repeatedly expelled its members. Yet it has steadily grown in power and has for nearly a century dictated the policy of the papal administration. Jesuits are to-day the chief diplomats of the Roman Catholic Church and they are surpassed in astuteness and the ability to achieve results by those of no civil government. The promulgation of the dogma of the immaculate conception of Mary (1854), the Encyclical and Syllabus of 1864, the Vatican Council with its decree of papal infallibility (1869–70), the recent drastic measures against Biblical criticism and in opposition to freedom of research and freedom of teaching and publishing, are commonly attributed to Jesuit influence. The society had, in 1902, 15,231 members, 6,743 being priests and 4,542 students for the priesthood. There are about 1,800 in the United States, and they are numerous in Canada, Mexico, Central and South America, Cuba, and the Philippines. [The Jesuits have from the beginning laid especial stress upon education and adopted a high standard. But they have had to run the gantlet of sharp criticism not only from Protestants but from Roman Catholics. Nor can it be explained away that the order was for a considerable period under the papal ban. Their secrecy, superior skill and learning, and especially the casuistry advocated in books written by members of the order, have concentrated much attention on them, not always to their approval. They can not claim exemption from the common failings of mankind, or any special divine leadership. They have had ambitious and unscrupulous members and have been under unworthy leadership. Their meddling in politics has not always been to their credit. But when all has been said against them the Jesuits still retain their preeminence. They were the authors of the Counter-Reformation which prevented the collapse of the Roman Catholic Church in lands in which Protestantism had gotten a hold. They gave their church its theology and raised its standard of education and of clerical morality. They cleansed it of much of its foulness, put new breath into its foreign missions, and everywhere displayed a zeal, patience and piety which revived the whole church. And these services in the past are continued into the present, and every year the Roman Catholic Church is still heavier in their debt.]

The number of Jesuits throughout the world is small. In 1902 there were but 15,231 of all grades. *The Official Catholic Directory* for 1909, pp. 746–747, gives these figures for the United States:

	Fathers.	Scholastics.	Lay Brothers.
New York - Maryland Province...........	340	333	157
Missouri Province......	338	252	158
New Mexico and Colorado Mission........	59	34	26
New Orleans Province..	132	77	48
California and Rocky Mountain Mission....	154	128	106
	1,023	824	495

III. Female Orders in Imitation of Jesuits: The Society of Jesus has no recognized affiliated societies of women. Before his first pilgrimage to Jerusalem Ignatius formed the acquaintance in Barcelona of Isabella de Rosella, a gifted and wealthy woman, and greatly interested her in his plans and purposes. When he returned in 1524 she ministered to his needs for a considerable time. In 1543, after the society had secured papal approval and when he was occupied with world-wide schemes for the mastery of the nations, she visited him in Rome, with two other like-minded ladies, and begged to be taken under his spiritual guidance. He was unwilling to assume this additional burden; but the persistent women secured from the pope an order (1545) that Ignatius should accede to their wishes. With great reluctance he yielded; but soon found that these women, with the small sisterhood that they had gathered, gave him more trouble than the administration of the affairs of the entire society, and at his earnest request the pope relieved him of the obligation (1547). It was no easy task to secure the consent of Isabella and her companions to be released from the obligations that they had been so eager to assume; but he was inexorable and Isabella had to be content to be a "mother" rather than "daughter" of the great leader. The English Ladies (q.v.) founded by Mary Ward, an English woman, at St. Omer in Flanders in 1609, sought affiliation with the Jesuits, but failed to secure permanent recognition as Jesuitesses. A similar sorority, founded in 1607 by Johanna, marchioness of Montserrat, came into close relations with the Jesuits without becoming identified with the society. The same may be said of the sisters of the Sacred Heart and of the Faith of Jesus. It is the policy of the Jesuits to influence and control many of the sisterhoods without assuming any responsibility for them and without entrusting to them the secrets of the society.

A. H. Newman.

Bibliography: A rather full list of works, including sources, is given in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, viii. 742 sqq.; and a monograph devoted to the subject is A. Carayon, *Bibliographie historique de la Compagnie de Jesus*, Paris, 1864. Without consulting the earlier and now often inaccessible editions of the documents which created and protected the society, it is possible to obtain a view of all that is essential in the late edition of the documents, 3 vols., Rome, 1869 sqq., which contains the Constitutions, the *Examen generale*, the pertinent papal bulls, briefs, and privileges, the decrees and canons of the General Constitution, the plan of study, the "Spiritual Exercises," and the *Directorium*. A late edition of the *Monita privata* is by C. Souvestre, Paris, 1880,

On the general history of the order the great work of De Backer (see vol. i., p. xxiii. of this work) and of Crétineau-Joly are of first importance; and the literature under Ignatius of Loyola contains much of importance. Consult further for the general history: Maynard, *The Studies and Teaching of the Society of Jesus at the Time of its Suppression, 1750–1753*, Baltimore, 1855; C. Paroissen, *Principles of the Jesuits*, London, 1860; J. M. S. Daurignac, *Hist. of the Society of Jesus*, 2 vols., Cincinnati, 1865; F. Nippold, *Der Jesuitenorden von seiner Wiederherstellung bis zur Gegenwart*, Mannheim, 1867; S. Rose, *Ignatius Loyola and the Early Jesuits*, London, 1871; J. Stephen, *Founders of Jesuitism*, in *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*, London, 1875; W. C. Cartwright, *The Jesuits; their Constitution and Teachings*, London, 1876; P. Bert, *La Morale des Jésuites*, Paris, 1880; T. Griesinger, *The Jesuits; a complete History of their Proceedings*, London, 1883; T. Carlyle, *Jesuitism*, in *Works*, II. 259–485, Boston, 1885; T. Hughes, *Loyola and the Educational System of the Jesuits*, London, 1892; G. B. Nicolini, *Hist. of the Jesuits; their Origin, Progress, Doctrines and Designs*, London, 1893; E. Piaget, *Essai sur l'organisation de la compagnie de Jésus*, Paris, 1893; F. H. Reusch, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Jesuitenordens*, Munich, 1894; R. W. Thompson, *The Footprints of the Jesuits*, New York, 1894; E. Gothein, *Ignatius von Loyola und die Gegenreformation*, Halle, 1895; M. F. Cusack, *The Black Pope; a Hist. of the Jesuits*, London, 1896; H. Müller, *Les Origines de la Compagnie de Jésus; Ignace et Lainez*, Paris, 1898; A. Hamy, *Galerie illustrée de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Paris, 1900; J. Michelet and E. Quinet, *Étude sur les Jésuites*, latest ed. Paris, 1900; J. Hochstetter, *Monita Secreta; Die geheimen Instruktionen der Jesuiten*, Stuttgart, 1901; *Kaiser Franz Joseph I. und die Jesuiten*, Barmen, 1901; L. Wittwe, *Friedrich der Grosse und die Jesuiten*, Halle, 1901; R. Schwickerath, *Jesuit Education, its History and Principles*, St. Louis, 1903; J. Bézy, *Un prédicateur apostolique au 16. siècle, Frey de Neuville, 1693–1774*, Paris, 1904; B. Pascal, *The Provincial Letters*, often reprinted, e.g., New York, 1904; P. Suan, *St. François de Borgia, 1510–1572*, Paris, 1905; A. Brou, *Les Jésuites de la legende.* Part I. *Les Origines jusqu'à Pascal*, Paris, 1906.

For the Jesuits in England consult: H. Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, 8 vols., London, 1877–83; A. Kobler, *Die Märtyrer und Bekenner der Gesellschaft Jesu in England 1580–1681*, Innsbruck, 1886; E. L. Taunton, *Hist. of the Jesuits in England, 1580–1773*, London, 1901; W. Walsh, *The Jesuits in Great Britain*, London, 1903. For their history in France: A. Carayon, *Documents inédits concernants la Compagnie de Jésus*, 23 vols., Poitiers, 1863 sqq.; J. Prat, *La Compagnie de Jésus en France*, 4 vols., Paris, 1877; E. Piaget, *Hist. de l'établissement des Jésuites en France 1540–1560*, Leyden, 1895; M. Chosset, *Les Jésuites et leurs œuvres à Avignon, 1553–1768*, Avignon, 1896; E. Souillier, *Les Jésuites à Marseille aux 16. et 18. siècles*, Avignon, 1899; J. Pra, *Les Jésuites à Grenoble, 1587–1763*, Lyons, 1901; J. Delfour, *Les Jésuites à Poitiers, 1604–1762*, Paris, 1902. For Germany: S. Sugenheim, *Geschichte der Jesuiten in Deutschland 1540–1773*, 2 vols., Frankfort, 1847; J. Hansen, *Rheinische Akten zur Geschichte des Jesuitenordens, 1542–1582*, Cologne, 1896; B. Duhr, *Die Jesuiten an den deutschen Fürstenhöfen des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Freiburg, 1901; idem, *Aktenstücke zur Geschichte der Jesuiten-Missionen in Deutschland, 1848–1872*, ib, 1903; idem, *Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge*, ib. 1907; M. Rist, *Die deutschen Jesuiten auf den Schlachtfeldern und in den Lazaretten 1866, 1870–1871*, Freiburg, 1904. For North America: *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents; Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France*, ed. R. G. Thwaites, 73 vols., Cleveland, O., 1896–1902; T. Hughes, *Hist. of Society of Jesus in North America colonial and federal*, vol. i. to 1645, London, 1907; idem, *Documents*, vol. i., part I., nos. 1–140 (1605–1838), London, 1908; F. Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century*, Boston, 1897; idem, *Pioneers of France in the New World*, ib. 1879; idem, *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*, ib. 1879; W. I. Kip, *The Early Jesuit Missions in North America*, New York, 1882; idem, *Historical Scenes from the Old Jesuit Missions*, ib. 1875; Z. Engelhardt, *The Missions and Missionaries of California*, San Francisco, 1908. For other countries: H. Lutteroth, *Russland und die Jesuiten 1772–1820*, Stuttgart, 1846; P. Mury, *Les Jésuites à Cayenne*, Strasburg, 1895; M. de Anglés y Gortari, *Los Jesuítas en el Paraguay*, Assumption, 1896; R. Perez, *La Companía de Jesus en Colombia y Centro-America*, Valladolid, 1896; A. Astrain, *Historia de la companía de Jesus en la asistencia de Espana*, 2 vols., Madrid, 1902–05; R. B. Cunningham Graham, *A Vanished Arcadia; being some account of the Jesuits in Paraguay, 1607 to 1767*, New York, 1901; F. Colin, *Labar evangelica de los Obreros de la Compañia de Jesus en las Islas Filipinas*, Barcelona, 1904.

JESUS CHRIST.

A.
I. Consideration of the Sources.
  Heathen Writers (§ 1).
  The Apostle Paul (§ 2).
  Paul and the Earthly Life of Jesus (§ 3).
  Other Epistolars (§ 4).
  The Gospel of Luke (§ 5).
  Mark and Matthew (§ 6).
  The Primitive "Narrative Source" (§ 7).
  "Sayings of Jesus" (§ 8).
  Individual Sections of Luke and Matthew (§ 9).
  The Gospel of John (§ 10).
  Gospel Portrait of Christ not Invented (§ 11).
II. The Portrait of Jesus.
  His Humiliation (§ 1).
  His Messiahship and Deity (§ 2).
  Central Conceptions (§ 3).
III. Attempts to Naturalize the Portrait of Jesus.
  Literary and Historical Criticism (§ 1).
  Methods of Historical Criticism (§ 2).
  Its Embarrassment (§ 3).
  Its Historical Development (§ 4).
  Its Issue (§ 5).
IV. The Life of Jesus.
  In What Sense a "Life" Impossible (§ 1).
  Framework of the "Life" (§ 2).
  Outline of the "Life" (§ 3).
  The Public Ministry (§ 4).
  Instruments of the Ministry (§ 5).
  The Virgin-Birth; the Resurrection (§ 6).
B.
I. Limitation of the Field.
II. The Sources.
  The Epistles of Paul (§ 1).
  The Gospels (§ 2).
  The Pauline Gospel (§ 3).
  Its Relations and Character (§ 4).
  The Petrine Gospel (§ 5).
  Its Character (§ 6).
  Consequences (§ 7).
  Four Types of Tradition (§ 8).
  The Gospel of John (§ 9).
  Matthew and Luke (§ 10).
  Q and the Aramaic Source (§ 11).
  Results of Source Analysis (§ 12).
III. Critical Outline of the Story of Jesus.
  Relations with John the Baptist (§ 1).
  The Motive for Jesus' Ministry (§ 2).
  Message and Miracles (§ 3).
  Breaking of Bread (§ 4).
  Collision with the Authorities (§ 5).
  The Crisis in Galilee (§ 6).
  Jesus as "Son of Man" (§ 7).
  The Finale (§ 8).
  The Issue (§ 9).

1. Heathen Writers.

A. I. Consideration of the Sources: The rise of Christianity was a phenomenon of too little apparent significance to attract the attention of the great world. It was only when it had refused to be quenched in the blood of its founder, and, breaking out of the narrow bounds of the obscure province in which it had its origin, was making itself felt in the centers of population, that it drew to itself a somewhat irritated notice. The interest of such heathen writers as mention it was in the movement, not in its author. But in speaking of the movement they tell something of its author, and what they tell is far from being of little moment. He was, it seems, a certain "Christ," who had lived in Judea in the reign of Tiberius (14–37 A.D.), and had been brought to capital punishment by the procurator, Pontius Pilate (q.v.; cf. Tacitus, *Annals*, xv. 44). The significance of his personality to the movement inaugurated by him is already suggested by the fact that he, and no other, had impressed his name upon it. But the name itself by which he was known particularly attracts notice. This is uniformly, in these heathen writers, "Christ," not "Jesus."* Suetonius (*Claudius*, xxv.) not unnaturally confuses this "Christus" with the Greek name "Chrestus"; but Tacitus and Pliny show themselves better informed and preserve it accurately. "Christ," however, is not a personal name, but the Greek rendering of the Hebrew title "Messiah." Clearly, then, it was as the promised Messiah of the Jews that their founder was reverenced by "the Christians"; and they had made so much of his Messiahship in speaking of him that the title "Christ" had actually usurped the place of his personal name, and he was everywhere known simply as "Christ." Their reverence for his person had, indeed, exceeded that commonly supposed to be due even to the Messianic dignity. Pliny records that this "Christ" was statedly worshiped by "the Christians" of Pontus and Bithynia as their God (Pliny, *Epist.*, xcvi. [xcvii.] to Trajan). Beyond these great facts the heathen historians give little information about the founder of Christianity.

2. The Apostle Paul.

What is lacking in them is happily supplied, however, by the writings of the Christians themselves. Christianity was from its beginnings a literary religion, and documentary records of it have come down from the very start. There are, for example, the letters of the Apostle Paul (q.v.), a highly cultured Romanized Jew of Tarsus, who early (34 or 35 A.D.) threw in his fortunes with the new religion, and by his splendid leadership established it in the chief centers of influence from Antioch to Rome. Written occasionally to one or another of the Christian communities of this region, at intervals during the sixth and seventh decades of the century, that is to say, from twenty to forty years after the origin of Christianity, these letters reflect the conceptions which ruled in the Christian communities of the time. Paul had known the Christian movement from its beginning; first from the outside, as one of the chief agents in its persecution, and then from the inside, as the most active leader of its propaganda. He was familiarly acquainted with the Apostles and other immediate followers of Jesus, and enjoyed repeated intercourse with them. He explicitly declares the harmony of their teaching with his, and joins with his their testimony to the great facts which he proclaimed. The complete consonance of his allusions to Jesus with what is gathered from the hints of the heathen historians is very striking. The person of Jesus fills the whole horizon of his thought, and gathers to itself all his religious emotions. That Jesus was the Messiah is the presupposition of all his speech of him, and the Messianic title has already become his proper name behind which his real personal name, Jesus, has retired. This Messiah is definitely represented as a divine being who has entered the world on a mission of mercy to sinful man, in the prosecution of which he has given himself up as a sacrifice for sin, but has risen again from the dead and ascended to the right hand of God, henceforth to rule as Lord of all. Around the two great facts, of the expiatory death of the Son of God and his rising again, Paul's whole teaching circles. Jesus Christ as crucified, Christ risen from the dead as the first fruits of those that sleep —here is Paul's whole gospel in summary.

---

* In Josephus, *Ant.* XVIII., iii. 3, XX., ix. 1, "Jesus," "Jesus, surnamed Christ," occur. But the authenticity of the passages is questionable, especially that of the former.

3. Paul and the Earthly Life of Jesus.

Into the details of Christ's earthly life Paul had no occasion to enter. But he shows himself fully familiar with them, and incidentally conveys a vivid portrait of Christ's personality. Of the seed of David on the human, as the Son of God on the divine side, he was born of a woman, under the law, and lived subject to its ordinances for his mission's sake, humbling himself even unto death, and that the death of the cross. His lowly estate is dwelt upon, and the high traits of his personal character manifested in his lowliness are lightly sketched in, justifying not merely the negative declaration that "he knew no sin," but his positive presentation as the model of all perfection. An item of his teaching is occasionally adverted to, or even quoted, always with the utmost reverence. Members of his immediate circle of followers are mentioned by name or by class—whether his brethren according to the flesh or the twelve apostles whom he appointed. The institution by him of a sacramental feast is described, and that of a companion sacrament of initiation by baptism is implied. But especially his sacrificial death on the cross is emphasized, his burial, his rising again on the third day, and his appearances to chosen witnesses, who are cited one after the other with the greatest solemnity. Such details are never communicated to Paul's readers as pieces of fresh information. They are alluded to as matters of common knowledge, and with the plainest intimation of the unquestioned recognition of them by all. Thus it is made clear not only that there underlies Paul's letters a complete portrait of Jesus and a full outline of his career, but that this portrait and this outline are the universal possession of Christians. They were doubtless as fully before his mind as such in the early years of his Christian life, in the thirties, as when he was writing his letters in the fifties and sixties. There is no indication in the way in which Paul touches on these things of a recent change of opinion regarding them or of a recent acquisition of knowledge of them. The testimony of Paul's letters, in a word, has retrospective value, and is contemporary testimony to the facts.

4. Other Epistolars.

Paul's testimony alone provides thus an exceptionally good basis for the historical verity of Jesus' personality and career. But Paul's testimony is far from standing alone. It is fully supported by the testimony of a series of other writings, similar to his own, purporting to come from the hands of early teachers of the Church, most of them from actual companions of our Lord and eye-witnesses of his majesty, and handed down to us with credible evidence of their authenticity. And it is extended by the testimony of a series of writings of a very different character; not occasional letters designed to meet particular crises or questions arising in the churches, but formal accounts of Jesus' words and acts.

5. The Gospel of Luke.

Among these attention is attracted first by a great historical work, the two parts of which bear the titles of "the Gospel according to Luke" and "the Acts of the Apostles." The first contains an account of Jesus' life from his birth to his death and resurrection; or, including the opening paragraphs of the second, to his ascension. What directs attention to it first among books of its class is the uncommonly full information possessed concerning its writer and his method of historical composition. It is the work of an educated Greek physician, known to have enjoyed, as a companion of Paul, special opportunities of informing himself of the facts of Jesus' career. Whatever Paul himself knew of the acts and teachings of his Lord was, of course, the common property of the band of missionaries which traveled in his company, and could not fail to be the subject of much public and private discussion among them. Among Paul's other companions there could not fail to be some whose knowledge of Jesus' life, direct or derived, was considerable; an example is found, for instance, in John Mark, who had come out of the immediate circle of Jesus' first followers, although precise knowledge of the meeting of Luke and Mark as fellow companions of Paul belongs to a little later period than the composition of Luke's Gospel. In company with Paul Luke had even visited Jerusalem and had resided two years at Cæsarea in touch with primitive disciples; and if the early tradition which represents him as a native of Antioch be accepted, he must be credited with facilities from the beginning of his Christian life for association with original disciples of Jesus. All that is needed to ground great confidence in his narrative as a trustworthy account of the facts it records is assurance that he had the will and capacity to make good use of his abounding opportunities for exact information, The former is afforded by the preface to his Gospel in which he reveals his method as a historian and his zeal for exactness of information and statement; the latter by the character of the Gospel, which evinces itself at every point a sincere and careful narrative resting upon good and well-sifted information. In these circumstances the determination of the precise time when this narrative was actually committed to paper becomes a matter of secondary importance; in any event its material was collected during the period of Paul's missionary activity. It may be confidently maintained, however, that it was also put together during this period, that is to say, during the earlier years of the seventh decade of the century. Confidence in its narrative is strengthened by the complete accord of the portrait of Jesus, which its detailed account exhibits with that which underlies the letters of Paul. Not only are the general traits of the personality identical, but the emphasis falls at the same places. In effect, the Jesus of Luke's narrative is the Christ of Paul's epistles in perfect dramatic presentation, and only two hypotheses offer themselves in possible explanation. Either Luke rests on Paul, and has with consummate art invented a historical basis for Paul's ideal Christ; or else Paul's allusions rest on a historical basis and Luke has preserved that historical basis in his careful detailed narrative. Every line of Luke's narrative refutes the former and demonstrates the latter supposition.

6. Mark and Matthew.

Additional evidence of the trustworthiness of Luke's Gospel as an account of Jesus' acts and teaching is afforded by the presence by its side of other narratives of similar character and accordant contents. These narratives are two in number and have been handed down under the names of members of the earliest circle of Christians—of John Mark, who was from the beginning in the closest touch with the apostolic body, and of Matthew, one of the apostles. On comparison of these narratives with Luke's, not only are they found to present, each with its own peculiar point of view and purpose, precisely the same conception and portrait of Jesus, but to have utilized in large measure also the same sources of information. Indeed, the entire body of Mark's Gospel is found to be incorporated also in Matthew's and Luke's.

7. The Primitive "Narrative Source."

This circumstance, in view of the declarations of Luke's preface, is of the utmost significance for an estimate of the trustworthiness of the narrative thus embodied in all three of the "Synoptic" Gospels. In this preface Luke professes to have had for his object the establishment of absolute "certainty," with respect to the things made the object of instruction in Christian circles; and to this end to have grounded his narrative in exact investigation of the course of events from the beginning. In the prosecution of this task, he knew himself to be working in a goodly company to a common end, namely, the narration of the Christian origins on the basis of the testimony of those ministers of the word who had been also "eye-witnesses from the beginning." He does not say whether these fellow narrators had or had not been, some or all of them, eye-witnesses of some or of all the events they narrated; he merely says that the foundation on which all the narratives he has in view rested was the testimony of eye-witnesses. He does not assert for his own treatise superiority to those of his fellow workers; he only claims an honorable place for his own treatise among the others on the ground of the diligence and care he has exercised in ascertaining and recording the facts, through which, he affirms, he has attained a certainty with regard to them on which his readers may depend. Now, on comparing the narrative of Luke with those of Matthew and Mark, it is discovered that one of the main sources on which Luke draws is also one of the main sources on which Matthew draws and practically the sole source on which Mark rests. Thus Luke's judgment of the value and trustworthiness of this source receives the notable support of the judgment of his fellow evangelists, and it can scarcely be doubted that what it contains is the veritable tradition of those who were as well eye-witnesses as ministers of the Word from the beginning, in whose accuracy confidence can be placed. If the three Synoptic Gospels do not give three independent testimonies to the facts which they record, they give what is, perhaps, better,—three independent witnesses to the trustworthiness of the narrative, which they all incorporate into their own as resting on autoptic testimony and thoroughly deserving of credit. A narrative lying at the basis of all three of these Gospels, themselves written certainly not later than the seventh decade of the century, must in any event be early in date, and in that sense must emanate from the first followers of Christ; and in the circumstances—of the large and confident use made of it by all three of these Gospels—can not fail to be an authentic statement of what was the conviction of the earliest circles of Christians.

8. The "Sayings of Jesus."

By the side of this ancient body of narrative must be placed another equally, or, perhaps, even more ancient source, consisting largely, but not exclusively, of reports of "sayings of Jesus." This underlies much of the fabric of Luke and Matthew where Mark fails, and by their employment of it is authenticated as containing, as Luke asserts, the trustworthy testimony of eye-witnesses. Its great antiquity is universally allowed, and there is no doubt that it comes from the very bosom of the Apostolical circle, bearing independent but thoroughly consentient testimony, with the narrative source which underlies all three of the Synoptists, of what was understood by the primitive Christian community to be the facts regarding Jesus. This is the fundamental fact about these two sources—that the Jesus which they present is the same Jesus; and that this Jesus is precisely the same Jesus found in the Synoptic Gospels themselves, presented, moreover, in precisely the same fashion and with the emphases in precisely the same places. This latter could, of course, not fail to be the case since these sources themselves constitute the main substance of the Synoptic Gospels into which they have been transfused. Its significance is that the portrait of Jesus as the supernatural Son of God who came into the world as the Messiah on a mission of mercy to sinful men, which is reflected even in the scanty notices of him that find an incidental place in the pages of heathen historians, which suffused the whole preaching of Paul and of the other missionaries of the first age, and which was wrought out into the details of a rich dramatization in the narratives of the Synoptic Gospels, is as old as Christianity itself and comes straight from the representations of Christ's first followers.

9. Individual Sections of Luke and Matthew.

Valuable, however, as the separation out from the Synoptic narrative of these underlying sources is in this aspect of the matter, appeal can not be made from the Synoptics to these sources as from less to more trustworthy documents. On the one hand, these sources do not exist outside the Synoptics; in them they have "found their grave." On the other hand, the Synoptics in large part are these sources; and their trustworthiness as wholes is guaranteed by the trustworthiness of the sources from which they have drawn the greater part of their materials, and from the general portraiture of Christ in which they do not in the least depart. Luke's claim in his preface that he has made accurate investigations, seeking to learn exactly what happened that he might attain certainty in his narrative, is expressly justified for the larger part of his narrative when the sources which underlie it are isolated and are found to approve themselves under every test as excellent. There is no reason to doubt that for the remainder of his narrative (and Matthew too for the remainder of his narrative) not derived from these two sources which the accident of their common use by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, or by Matthew and Luke, reveals, he (or Matthew) derives his material from equally good and trustworthy sources which happen to be used only by him. The general trustworthiness of Luke's narrative is not lessened but enhanced by the circumstance that, in the larger portion of it, he has the support of other evangelists in his confident use of his sources, with the effect that these sources can be examined and an approving verdict reached upon them. His judgment of sources is thus confirmed, and his claim to possess exact information and to have framed a trustworthy narrative is vindicated. What he gives from sources which were not used by the other evangelists, that is to say, in that portion of his narrative which is peculiar to himself (and the same must be said for Matthew, *mutatis mutandis*), has earned a right to credit on his own authentication. It is not surprising, therefore, that the portions of the narratives of Matthew and Luke which are peculiar to the one or the other bear every mark of sincere and well-informed narration and contain many hints of resting on good and trustworthy sources. In a word, the Synoptic Gospels supply a threefold sketch of the acts and teachings of Christ of exceptional trustworthiness. If here is not historical verity, historical verity would seem incapable of being attained, recorded, and transmitted by human hands.

10. The Gospel of John.

Along with the Synoptic Gospels there has been handed down by an unexceptionable line of testimony under the name of the Apostle John, another narrative of the teaching and work of Christ of equal fulness with that of the Synoptic Gospels, and yet so independent of theirs as to stand out in a sense in strong contrast with theirs, and even to invite attempts to establish a contradiction between it and them. There is, however, no contradiction, but rather a deep-lying harmony. There are so-called Synoptical traits discoverable in John, and not only are Johannine elements imbedded in the Synoptical narrative, but an occasional passage occurs in it which is almost more Johannine than John himself. Take, for example, that pregnant declaration recorded in Matt. xi. 27–28, which, as it occurs also in Luke (x. 21, 22), must have had a place in that ancient source drawn on in common by these two Gospels which comes from the first days of Christianity. All the high teaching of John's Gospel, as has been justly remarked, is but "a series of variations" upon the theme here given its "classical expression." The type of teaching which is brought forward and emphasized by John is thus recognized on all hands from the beginning to have had a place in Christ's teaching; and John differs from the Synoptics only in the special aspect of Christ's teaching which he elects particularly to present. The naturalness of this type of teaching on the lips of the Jesus of the Synoptists is also undeniable; it must be allowed—and is now generally allowed—that by the writers of the Synoptic Gospels, and, it should be added, by their sources as well, Jesus is presented, and is presented as representing himself, as being all that John represents him to be when he calls him the Word, who was in the beginning with God and was God. The relation of John and the Synoptists in their portraiture of Jesus somewhat resembles, accordingly, that of Plato and Xenophon in their portraiture of Socrates; only, with this great difference—that both Plato and Xenophon were primarily men of letters and the portrait they draw of Socrates is in the hands of both alike eminently a sophisticated and literary one, while the evangelists set down simply the facts as they appealed to them severally. The definite claim which John's Gospel makes to be the work of one of the inner circle of the companions of Jesus is supported, moreover, by copious evidence that it comes from the hands of such a one as a companion of Jesus would be—a Jew, who possessed an intimate knowledge of Palestine, and was acquainted with the events of our Lord's life as only an eye-witness could be acquainted with them, and an eye-witness who had been admitted to very close association with him. That its narrative rests on good information is repeatedly manifested; and more than once historical links are supplied by it which are needed to give clearness to the Synoptical narrative, as, for example, in the chronological framework of the ministry of Jesus and the culminating miracle of the raising of Lazarus, which is required to account for the incidents of the Passion-Week. It presents no different Jesus from the Jesus of the Synoptists, and it throws the emphasis at the same place—on his expiatory death and rising again; but it notably supplements the narrative of the Synoptists and reveals a whole new side of Jesus' ministry, and if not a wholly new aspect of his teaching, yet a remarkable mass of that higher aspect of his teaching of which only occasional specimens are included in the Synoptic narrative. John's narrative thus rounds out the Synoptical narrative and gives the portrait drawn in it a richer content and a greater completeness.

11. Gospel Portrait of Christ Not Invented.

This portrait may itself be confidently adduced as its own warranty. It is not too much to say with Nathaniel Lardner that "the history of the New Testament has in it all the marks of credibility that any history can have." But apart from these more usually marshaled evidences of the trustworthiness of the narratives, there is the portrait itself which they draw, and this can not by any possibility have been an invention. It is not merely that the portrait is harmonious throughout—in the allusions and presuppositions of the epistles of Paul and the other letter-writers of the New Testament, in the detailed narratives of the Synoptists and John, and in each of the sources which underlie them. This is a matter of importance; but it is not the matter of chief moment; there is no need to dwell upon the impossibility of such a harmony having been maintained save on the basis of simple truthfulness of record, or to dispute whether in the case of the Synoptics there are three independent witnesses to the one portrait, or only the two independent witnesses of their two most prominent "sources." Nor is the most interesting point whether the aboriginality of this portrait is guaranteed by the harmony of the representation in all the sources of information, some of which reach back to the most primitive epoch of the Christian movement. It is quite certain that this conception of Christ's person and career was the conception of his immediate followers, and indeed of himself; but, important as this conclusion is, it is still not the matter of primary import. The matter of primary significance is that this portrait thus imbedded in all the authoritative sources of information, and thus proved to be the conception of its founder cherished by the whole of primitive Christendom, and indeed commended to it by that founder himself, is a portrait intrinsically incapable of invention by men. It could never have come into being save as the revelation of an actual person embodying it, who really lived among men. "A romancer," as even Albert Réville allows, "can not attribute to a being which he creates an ideal superior to what he himself is capable of conceiving." The conception of the God-man which is embodied in the portrait which the sources draw of Christ, and which is dramatized by them through such a history as they depict, can be accounted for only on the assumption that such a God-man actually lived, was seen of men, and was painted from the life. The miracle of the invention of such a portraiture, whether by the conscious effort of art, or by the unconscious working of the mythopeic fancy, would be as great as the actual existence of such a person. Of this there is sufficient *a posteriori* proof in the invariable deterioration this portrait suffers in its secondary reproductions—in the so-called "Lives of Christ," of every type. The attempt vitally to realize and reproduce it results inevitably in its reduction. A portraiture which can not even be interpreted by men without suffering serious loss can not be the invention of the first simple followers of Jesus. Its very existence in their unsophisticated narratives is the sufficient proof of its faithfulness to a great reality.

II. The Portrait of Jesus: Only an outline of this portrait can be set down here. Jesus appears in it not only a supernatural, but in all the sources alike specifically a divine, person, who came into the world on a mission of mercy to sinful man. Such a mission was in its essence a humiliation and involved humiliation at every step of its accomplishment. His life is represented accordingly as a life of difficulty and conflict, of trial and suffering, issuing in a shameful death. But this humiliation is represented as in every step and stage of it voluntary. It was entered into and abided in solely in the interests of his mission, and did not argue at any point of it helplessness in the face of the difficulties which hemmed him in more and more until they led him to death on the cross. It rather manifested his strong determination to fulfil his mission to the end, to drink to its dregs the cup he had undertaken to drink. Accordingly, every suggestion of escape from it by the use of his intrinsic divine powers, whether of omnipotence or of omniscience, was treated by him first and last as a temptation of the evil one. The death in which his life ends is conceived, therefore, as the goal in which his life culminates. He came into the world to die, and every stage of the road that led up to this issue was determined not for him but by him: he was never the victim but always the master of circumstance, and pursued his pathway from beginning to end, not merely in full knowledge from the start of all its turns and twists up to its bitter conclusion, but in complete control both of them and of it.

1. His Humiliation.

His life of humiliation, sinking into his terrible death, was therefore not his misfortune, but his achievement as the promised Messiah, by and in whom the kingdom of God is to be established in the world; it was the work which as Messiah he came to do. Therefore, in his prosecution of it, he from the beginning announced himself as the Messiah, accepted all ascriptions to him of Messiahship under whatever designation, and thus gathered up into his person all the preadumbrations of Old-Testament prophecy; and by his favorite self-designation of "Son of Man," derived from Daniel's great vision (vii. 13), continually proclaimed himself the Messiah he actually was, emphasizing in contrast with his present humilia-

2. His Messiahship and Deity.

tion his heavenly origin and his future glory. Moreover, in the midst of his humiliation, he exercised, so far as that was consistent with the performance of his mission, all the prerogatives of that "transcendent" or divine Messiah which he was. He taught with authority, substituting for every other sanction, his great "But I say unto you," and declaring himself greater than the greatest of God's representatives whom he had sent in all the past to visit his people. He surrounded himself as he went about preaching the Gospel of the kingdom with a miraculous nimbus, each and every miracle in which was adapted not merely to manifest the presence of a supernatural person in the midst of the people, but, as a piece of symbolical teaching, to reveal the nature of this supernatural person, and to afford a foretaste of the blessedness of his rule in the kingdom he came to found. He assumed plenary authority over the religious ordinances of the people, divinely established though they were; and exercised absolute control over the laws of nature themselves. The divine prerogative of forgiving sins he claimed for himself, the divine power of reading the heart he frankly exercised, the divine function of judge of quick and dead he attached to his own person. Asserting for himself a superhuman dignity of person, or rather a share in the ineffable Name itself, he represented himself as abiding continually even when on earth in absolute communion with God the Father, and participating by necessity of nature in the treasures of the divine knowledge and grace; announced himself the source of all divine knowledge and grace to men; and drew to himself all the religious affections, suspending the destinies of men absolutely upon their relation to his own person. Nevertheless he walked straight onward in the path of his lowly mission, and, bending even the wrath of men to his service, gave himself in his own good time and way to the death he had come to accomplish. Then, his mission performed, he rose again from the dead in the power of his deathless life; showed himself alive to chosen witnesses, that he might strengthen the hearts of his people; and ascended to the right hand of God, whence he directs the continued preparation of the kingdom until it shall please him to return for its establishment in its glorious eternal form.

3. Central Conceptions.

It is important to fix firmly in mind the central conception of this representation. It turns upon the sacrificial death of Jesus to which the whole life leads up, and out of which all its issues are drawn, and for a perpetual memorial of which he is represented as having instituted a solemn memorial feast. The divine majesty of this Son of God; his redemptive mission to the world, in a life of humiliation and a ransoming death; the completion of his task in accordance with his purpose; his triumphant rising from the death thus vicariously endured; his assumption of sovereignty over the future development of the kingdom founded in his blood, and over the world as the theater of its development; his expected return as the consummator of the ages and the judge of all—this is the circle of ideas in which all accounts move. It is the portrait not of a merely human life, though it includes the delineation of a complete and a completely human life. It is the portrayal of a human episode in the divine life. It is, therefore, not merely connected with supernatural occurrences, nor merely colored by supernatural features, nor merely set in a supernatural atmosphere: the supernatural is its very substance, the elimination of which would be the evaporation of the whole. The Jesus of the New Testament is not fundamentally man, however divinely gifted: he is God tabernacling for a while among men, with heaven lying about him not merely in his infancy, but throughout all the days of his flesh.

III. Attempts to Naturalize the Portrait of Jesus: The intense supernaturalism of this portraiture is, of course, an offense to our anti-supernaturalistic age. It is only what was to be expected, therefore, that throughout the last century and a half a long series of scholars, imbued with the anti-supernaturalistic instinct of the time, have assumed the task of desupernaturalizing it. Great difficulty has been experienced, however, in the attempt to construct a historical sieve which will strain out miracles and yet let Jesus through; for Jesus is himself the greatest miracle of them all. Accordingly in the end of the day there is a growing disposition, as if in despair of accomplishing this feat, boldly to construct the sieve so as to strain out Jesus too; to take refuge in the counsel of desperation which affirms that there never was such a person as Jesus, that Christianity had no founder, and that not merely the portrait of Jesus, but Jesus himself, is a pure projection of later ideals into the past. The main stream of assault still addresses itself, however, to the attempt to eliminate not Jesus himself, but the Jesus of the evangelists, and to substitute for him a desupernaturalized Jesus.

1. Literary and Historical Criticism.

The instruments which have been relied on to effect this result may be called, no doubt with some but not misleading inexactitude, literary and historical criticism. The attempt has been made to track out the process by which the present witnessing documents have come into existence, to show them gathering accretions in this process, and to sift out the sources from which they are drawn; and then to make appeal to these sources as the only real witnesses. And the attempt has been made to go behind the whole written record, operating either immediately upon the documents as they now exist, or ultimately upon the sources which literary criticism has sifted out from them, with a view to reaching a more primitive and presumably truer conception of Jesus than that which has obtained record in the writings of his followers. The occasion for resort to this latter method of research is the failure of the former to secure the results aimed at. For, when, at the dictation of anti-supernaturalistic presuppositions, John is set aside in favor of the Synoptics, and then the Synoptics are set aside in favor of Mark, conceived as the representative of "the narrative source" (by the side of which must be placed—

though this is not always remembered—the second source of "Sayings of Jesus," which underlies so much of Matthew and Luke; and also—though this is even more commonly forgotten—whatever other sources either Matthew or Luke has drawn upon for material), it still appears that no progress whatever has been made in eliminating the divine Jesus and his supernatural accompaniment of mighty works—although, chronologically speaking, the very beginning of Christianity has been reached. It is necessary, accordingly, if there is not to be acknowledged a divine Christ with a supernatural history, to get behind the whole literary tradition. Working on Mark, therefore, taken as the original Gospel, an attempt must be made to distinguish between the traditional element which he incorporates into his narrative and the dogmatic element which he (as the mouthpiece of the Christian community) contributes to it. Or, working on the "Sayings," discrimination must first be made between the narrative element (assumed to be colored by the thought of the Christian community) and the reportorial element (which may repeat real sayings of Jesus); and then, within the reportorial element, all that is too lofty for the naturalistic Jesus must be trimmed down until it fits in with his simply human character. Or, working on the Gospels as they stand, inquisition must be made for statements of fact concerning Jesus or for sayings of his, which, taken out of the context in which the evangelists have placed them and cleansed from the coloring given by them, may be made to seem inconsistent with "the worship of Jesus" which characterizes these documents; and on the narrower basis thus secured there is built up a new portrait of Jesus, contradictory to that which the evangelists have drawn.

2. Methods of Historical Criticism.

The precariousness of these proceedings, or rather, frankly, their violence, is glaringly evident. In the processes of such criticism it is pure subjectivity which rules, and the investigator gets out as results only what he puts in as premises. And even when the desired result has thus been wrested from the unwilling documents, he discovers that he has only brought himself into the most extreme historical embarrassment. By thus desupernaturalizing Jesus he leaves primitive Christianity and its supernatural Jesus wholly without historical basis or justification. The naturalizing historian has therefore at once to address himself to supplying some account of the immediate universal ascription to Jesus by his followers of qualities which he did not possess and to which he laid no claim; and that with such force and persistence of conviction as totally to supersede from the very beginning with their perverted version of the facts the actual reality of things. It admits of no doubt, and it is not doubted, that supernaturalistic Christianity is the only historical Christianity. It is agreed on all hands that the very first followers of Jesus ascribed to him a supernatural character. It is even allowed that it is precisely by virtue of its supernaturalistic elements that Christianity has made its way in the world. It is freely admitted that it was by the force of its enthusiastic proclamation of the divine Christ, who could not be holden of death but burst the bonds of the grave, that Christianity conquered the world to itself. What account shall be given of all this? There is presented a problem here, which is insoluble on the naturalistic hypothesis. The old mythical theory fails because it requires time, and no time is at its disposal; the primitive Christian community believed in the divine Christ. The new "history-of-religions" theory fails because it can not discover the elements of that "Christianity before Christ" which it must posit, either remotely in the Babylonian inheritance of the East, or close by in the prevalent Messianic conceptions of contemporary Judaism. Nothing is available but the postulation of pure fanaticism in Jesus' first followers, which finds it convenient not to proceed beyond the general suggestion that there is no telling what fanaticism may not invent. The plain fact is that the supernatural Jesus is needed to account for the supernaturalistic Christianity which is grounded in him. Or—if this supernaturalistic Christianity does not need a supernatural Jesus to account for it, it is hard to see why any Jesus at all need be postulated. Naturalistic criticism thus overreaches itself and is caught up suddenly by the discovery that in abolishing the supernatural Jesus it has abolished Jesus altogether, since this supernatural Jesus is the only Jesus which enters as a factor into the historical development. It is the desupernaturalized Jesus which is the mythical Jesus, who never had any existence, the postulation of the existence of whom explains nothing and leaves the whole historical development hanging in the air.

3. Its Embarrassment.

It is instructive to observe the lines of development of the naturalistic reconstruction of the Jesus of the evangelists through the century and a half of its evolution. The normal task which the student of the life of Jesus sets himself is to penetrate into the spirit of the transmission so far as that transmission approves itself to him as trustworthy, to realize with exactness and vividness the portrait of Jesus conveyed by it, and to reproduce that portrait in an accurate and vital portrayal. The naturalistic reconstructors, on the other hand, engage themselves in an effort to substitute for the Jesus of the transmission another Jesus of their own, a Jesus who will seem "natural" to them, and will work in "naturally" with their naturalistic world-view. In the first instance it was the miracles of Jesus which they set themselves to eliminate, and this motive ruled their criticism from Reimarus (1694–1768), or rather, from the publication of the Wolfenbuettel Fragments (q.v.), to Strauss (1835–36). The dominant method employed—which found its culminating example in H. E. G. Paulus (1828)—was to treat the narrative as in all essentials historical, but to seek in each miraculous story a natural fact underlying it. This whole point of view was transcended by the advent of the mythical view in Strauss, who laughed it out of court. Since then miracles have been treated ever more and more

4. Its Historical Development.

confidently as negligible quantities, and the whole strength of criticism has been increasingly expended on the reduction of the supernatural figure of Jesus to “natural” proportions. The instrument relied upon to produce this effect has been psychological analysis; the method being to rework the narrative in the interests of what is called a “comprehensible” Jesus. The whole mental life of Jesus and the entire course of his conduct have been subjected to psychological canons derived from the critics’ conception of a purely human life, and nothing has been allowed to him which does not approve itself as “natural” according to this standard. The result is, of course, that the Jesus of the evangelists has been transformed into a nineteenth-century “liberal” theologian, and no conceptions or motives or actions have been allowed to him which would not be “natural” in such a one.

The inevitable reaction which seems to be now asserting itself takes two forms, both of which, while serving themselves heirs to the negative criticism of this “liberal” school, decisively reject its positive construction of the figure of Jesus. A weaker current contents itself with drawing attention to the obvious fact that such a Jesus as the “liberal” criticism yields will not account for the Christianity which actually came into being; and on this ground proclaims the “liberal” criticism bankrupt and raises the question, what need there is for assuming any Jesus at all. If the only Jesus salvable from the débris of legend is obviously not the author of the Christianity which actually came into being, why not simply recognize that Christianity came into being without any author—was just the crystallization of conceptions in solution at the time? A stronger current, scoffing at the projection of a nineteenth-century “liberal” back into the first century and calling him “Jesus,’ insists that “the historical Jesus” was just a Jew of his day, a peasant of Galilee with all the narrowness of a peasant’s outlook and all the deficiency in culture which belonged to a Galilean countryman of the period. Above all, it insists that the real Jesus, possessed by those Messianic dreams which filled the minds of the Jewish peasantry of the time, was afflicted with the great delusion that he was himself the promised Messiah. Under the obsession of this portentous fancy he imagined that God would intervene with his almighty arm and set him on the throne of a conquering Israel; and when the event falsified this wild hope, he assuaged his bitter disappointment with the wilder promise that he would rise from death itself and come back to establish his kingdom. Thus the naturalistic criticism of a hundred and fifty years has run out into no Jesus at all, or worse than no Jesus, a fanatic or even a paranoiac. The “liberal” criticism which has had it so long its own way is called sharply to its defense against the fruit of its own loins. In the process of this defense it wavers before the assault and incorporates more or less of the new conception of Jesus—of the “consistently eschatological” Jesus—into its fabric. Or it stands in its tracks and weakly protests that Jesus’ figure must be conceived as greatly as possible, so only it be kept strictly within the limits of a mere human being. Or it develops an apologetical argument which, given its full validity and effect, would undo all its painfully worked-out negative results and lead back to the Jesus of the evangelists as the true “historical Jesus.”

5. Its Issue.

It has been remarked above that the portrait of Jesus drawn in the sources is its own credential; no man, and no body of men, can have invented this figure, consciously or unconsciously, and dramatized it consistently through such a varied and difficult life-history. It may be added that the Jesus of the naturalistic criticism is its own refutation. One wonders whether the “liberal” critics realize the weakness, ineffectiveness, inanition of the Jesus they offer; the pitiful inertness they attribute to him, his utter passivity under the impact of circumstance. So far from being conceivable as the molder of the ages, this Jesus is wholly molded by his own surroundings, the sport of every suggestion from without. In their preoccupation with critical details, it is possible that its authors are scarcely aware of the grossness of the reduction of the figure of Jesus they have perpetrated. But let them only turn to portray their new Jesus in a life-history, and the pitiableness of the figure they have made him smites the eye. Whatever else may be said of it, this must be said—that out of the Jesus into which the naturalistic criticism has issued—in its best or in its worst estate—the Christianity which has conquered the world could never have come.

IV. The Life of Jesus: The firmness, clearness, and even fulness with which the figure of Jesus is delineated in the sources, and the variety of activities through which it is dramatized, do not insure that the data given should suffice for drawing up a properly so-called “life of Jesus.”

1. In What Sense a “Life” Impossible.

The data in the sources are practically confined to the brief period of Jesus’ public work. Only a single incident is recorded from his earlier life, and that is taken from his boyhood. So large a portion of the actual narrative, moreover, is occupied with his death that it might even be said—the more that the whole narrative also leads up to the death as the life’s culmination—that little has been preserved concerning Jesus but the circumstances which accompanied his birth and the circumstances which led up to and accompanied his death. The incidents which the narrators record, again, are not recorded with a biographical intent, and are not selected for their biographical significance, or ordered so as to present a biographical result: in the case of each evangelist they serve a particular purpose which may employ biographical details, but is not itself a biographical end. In other words the Gospels are not formal biographies but biographical arguments—a circumstance which does not affect the historicity of the incidents they select for record, but does affect the selection and ordering of these incidents. Mark has in view to show that this great religious movement in which he himself had a part had its beginnings in a divine interposition; Matthew, that this divine interposition was in fulfilment of the promises made to Israel; Luke, that it had as its end the redemption of the world; John, that the agent in it was none other than the Son of God himself. In the enforcement and illustration of their several themes each records a wealth of biographical details. But it does not follow that these details, when brought together and arranged in their chronological sequence, or even in their genetic order, will supply an adequate biography. The attempt to work them up into a biography is met, moreover, by a great initial difficulty. Every biographer takes his position, as it were, above his subject, who must live his life over again in his biographer's mind; it is of the very essence of the biographer's work thoroughly to understand his subject and to depict him as he understands him. What, then, if the subject of the biography be above the comprehension of his biographer? Obviously, in that case, a certain reduction can scarcely be avoided. This in an instance like the present, where the subject is a superhuman being, is the same as to say that a greater or lesser measure of rationalization, "naturalization," inevitably takes place. A true biography of a God-man, a biography which depicts his life from within, untangling the complex of motives which moved him, and explaining his conduct by reference to the internal springs of action, is in the nature of the case an impossibility for men. Human beings can explain only on the basis of their own experiences and mental processes; and so explaining they instinctively explain away what transcends their experiences and confounds their mental processes. Seeking to portray the life of Jesus as natural, they naturalize it, that is, reduce it to correspondence with their own nature. Every attempt to work out a life of Christ must therefore face not only the insufficiency of the data, but the perennial danger of falsifying the data by an instinctive naturalization of them. If, however, the expectation of attaining a "psychological" biography of Jesus must be renounced, and even a complete external life can not be pieced together from the fragmentary communications of the sources, a clear and consistent view of the course of the public ministry of Jesus can still be derived from them. The consecution of the events can be set forth, their causal relations established, and their historical development explicated. To do this is certainly in a modified sense to outline "the life of Jesus," and to do this proves by its results to be eminently worth while.

2. Framework of the "Life."

A series of synchronisms with secular history indicated by Luke, whose historical interest seems more alert than that of the other evangelists, gives the needed information for placing such a "life" in its right historical relations. The chronological framework for the "life" itself is supplied by the succession of annual feasts which are recorded by John as occurring during Jesus' public ministry. Into this framework the data furnished by the other Gospels—which are not without corroborative suggestions of order, season of occurrence, and relations—fit readily; and when so arranged yield so self-consistent and rationally developing a history as to add a strong corroboration of its trustworthiness. Differences of opinion respecting the details of arrangement of course remain possible; and these differences are not always small and not always without historical significance. But they do not affect the general outline or the main drift of the history, and on most points, even those of minor importance, a tolerable agreement exists. Thus, for example, it is all but universally allowed that Jesus was born c. 5 or 6 B.C. (year of Rome 748 or 749), and it is an erratic judgment indeed which would fix on any other year than 29 or 30 A.D. for his crucifixion. On the date of his baptism—which determines the duration of his public ministry—more difference is possible; but it is quite generally agreed that it took place late in 26 A.D. or early in 27. It is only by excluding the testimony of John that a duration of less than between two and three years can be assigned to the public ministry; and then only by subjecting the Synoptical narrative to considerable pressure. The probabilities seem strongly in favor of extending it to three years and some months. The decision between a duration of two years and some months and a duration of three years and some months depends on the determination of the two questions of where in the narrative of John the imprisonment of John the Baptist (Matt. iv. 12) is to be placed, and what the unnamed feast is which is mentioned in John v. 1. On the former of these questions opinion varies only between John iv. 1–3 and John v. 1. On the latter a great variety of opinions exists: some think of Passover, others of Purim or Pentecost, or of Trumpets or Tabernacles, or even of the day of Atonement. On the whole, the evidence seems decisively preponderant for placing the imprisonment of the Baptist at John iv. 1–3, and for identifying the feast of John v. 1 with Passover. In that case, the public ministry of Jesus covered about three years and a third, and it is probably not far wrong to assign to it the period lying between the latter part of 26 A.D. and the Passover of 30 A.D.*

3. Outline of the "Life."

The material supplied by the Gospel narrative distributes itself naturally under the heads of (1) the preparation, (2) the ministry, and (3) the consummation. For the first twelve or thirteen years of Jesus' life nothing is recorded except the striking circumstances connected with his birth, and a general statement of his remarkable growth. Similarly for his youth, about seventeen years and a half, there is recorded only the single incident, at its beginning, of his conversation with the doctors in the temple. Anything like continuous narrative begins only with the public ministry, in, say, December, 26 A.D. This narrative falls naturally into four parts which may perhaps be distinguished as

---

* Ramsay, Sanday, and Turner prefer 29 A.D. for the date of the crucifixion. Turner's dates are: birth, 7–6 B.C.; baptism, 26 A.D.; ministry, between two and three years; death, 29 A.D. Sanday's dates are: birth, —; baptism, late 26 A.D.; ministry, two and a half years; death, 29 A.D. Ramsay's dates are: birth, autumn, 6 B.C.; baptism, early in 26 A.D.; ministry, three years and some months; death, 29 A.D.

(a) the beginning of the Gospel, forty days, from December, 26 to February, 27; (b) the Judean ministry, covering about ten months, from Feb., 27 to Dec., 27; (c) the Galilean ministry, covering about twenty-two months, from Dec., 27 to Sept., 29; (d) the last journeys to Jerusalem, covering some six months, from Sept., 29 to the Passover of (Apr.) 30. The events of this final Passover season, the narrative of which becomes so detailed and precise that the occurrences from day to day are noted, constitute, along with their sequences, what is here called "the consummation." They include the events which led up to the crucifixion of Jesus, the crucifixion itself, and the manifestations which he gave of himself after his death up to his ascension. So preponderating was the interest which the reporters took in this portion of the "life of Christ," that is to say, in his death and resurrection, that about a third of their whole narrative is devoted to it. The ministry which leads up to it is also, however, full of incident. What is here called "the beginning of the Gospel" gives, no doubt, only the accounts of Jesus' baptism and temptation. Only meager information is given also, and that by John alone, of the occurrences of the first ten months after his public appearance, the scene of which lay mainly in Judea. With the beginning of the ministry in Galilee, however, with which alone the Synoptic Gospels concern themselves, incidents become numerous. Capernaum now becomes Jesus' home for almost two full years; and no less than eight periods of sojourn there with intervening circuits going out from it as a center can be traced. When the object of this ministry had been accomplished Jesus finally withdraws from Galilee and addresses himself to the preparation of his followers for the death he had come into the world to accomplish; and this he then brings about in the manner which best subserves his purpose.

4. The Public Ministry.

Into the substance of Jesus' ministry it is not possible to enter here. Let it only be observed that it is properly called a ministry. He himself testified that he came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and he added that this ministry was fulfilled in his giving his life as a ransom for many. In other words, the main object of his work was to lay the foundations of the kingdom of God in his blood. Subsidiary to this was his purpose to make vitally known to men the true nature of the kingdom of God, to prepare the way for its advent in their hearts, and above all, to attach them by faith to his person as the founder and consummator of the kingdom. His ministry involved, therefore, a constant presentation of himself to the people as the promised One, in and by whom the kingdom of God was to be established, a steady "campaign of instruction" as to the nature of the kingdom which he came to found, and a watchful control of the forces which were making for his destruction, until, his work of preparation being ended, he was ready to complete it by offering himself up. The progress of his ministry is governed by the interplay of these motives. It has been broadly distributed into a year of obscurity, a year of popular favor, and a year of opposition; and if these designations are understood to have only a relative applicability, they may be accepted as generally describing from the outside the development of the ministry. Beginning first in Judea Jesus spent some ten months in attaching to himself his first disciples, and with apparent fruitlessness proclaiming the kingdom at the center of national life. Then, moving north to Galilee, he quickly won the ear of the people and carried them to the height of their present receptivity; whereupon, breaking from them, he devoted himself to the more precise instruction of the chosen band he had gathered about him to be the nucleus of his Church. The Galilean ministry thus divides into two parts, marked respectively by more popular and more intimate teaching. The line of division falls at the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand, which, as marking a crisis in the ministry, is recorded by all four evangelists, and is the only miracle which has received this fourfold record. Prior to this point, Jesus' work had been one of gathering disciples; subsequently to it, it was a work of instructing and sifting the disciples whom he had gathered. The end of the Galilean ministry is marked by the confession of Peter and the transfiguration, and after it nothing remained but the preparation of the chosen disciples for the death, which was to close his work; and the consummation of his mission in his death and rising again.

5. Instruments of the Ministry.

The instruments by which Jesus carried out his ministry were two, teaching and miracles. In both alike he manifested his deity. Wherever he went the supernatural was present in word and deed. His teaching was with authority. In its insight and foresight it was as supernatural as the miracles themselves; the hearts of men and the future lay as open before him as the forces of nature lay under his control; all that the Father knows he knew also, and he alone was the channel of the revelation of it to men. The power of his "But I say unto you" was as manifest as that of his compelling "Arise and walk." The theme of his teaching was the kingdom of God and himself as its divine founder and king. Its form ran all the way from crisp gnomic sayings and brief comparisons to elaborate parables and profound spiritual discussions in which the deep things of God are laid bare in simple, searching words. The purport of his miracles was that the kingdom of God was already present in its King. Their number is perhaps usually greatly underestimated. It is true that only about thirty or forty are actually recorded. But these are recorded only as specimens, and as such they represent all classes. Miracles of healing form the preponderant class; but there are also exorcisms, nature-miracles, raisings of the dead. Besides these recorded miracles, however, there are frequent general statements of abounding miraculous manifestations. For a time disease and death must have been almost banished from the land. The country was thoroughly aroused and filled with wonder. In the midst of this universal excitement—when the people were ready to take him by force and make him king—he withdrew himself from them, and throwing his circuits far afield, beyond the bruit and uproar, addressed himself to preparing his chosen companions for his great sacrifice—first leading them in the so-called "Later Galilean ministry" (from the feeding of the 5,000 to the confession at Cæsarea Philippi) to a better apprehension of the majesty of his person as the Son of God, and of the character of the kingdom he came to found, as consisting not in meat and drink but in righteousness; and then, in the so-called "Peræan ministry" (from the confession at Cæsarea Philippi to the final arrival at Jerusalem) specifically preparing them for his death and resurrection. Thus he walked straightforward in the path he had chosen, and his choice of which is already made clear in the account of his temptation, set at the beginning of his public career; and in his own good time and way—in the end forcing the hand of his opponents to secure that he should die at the Passover—shed his blood as the blood of the new covenant sacrifice for the remission of sins. Having power thus to lay down his life, he had power also to take it again, and in due time he rose again from the dead and ascended to the right hand of the majesty on high, leaving behind him his promise to come again in his glory, to perfect the kingdom he had inaugurated.

6. The Virgin-Birth; the Resurrection.

It is appropriate that this miraculous life should be set between the great marvels of the virgin-birth and the resurrection and ascension. These can appear strange only when the intervening life is looked upon as that of a merely human being, endowed, no doubt, not only with unusual qualities, but also with the unusual favor of God, yet after all nothing more than human and therefore presumably entering the world like other human beings, and at the end paying the universal debt of human nature. From the standpoint of the evangelical writers, and of the entirety of primitive Christianity, which looked upon Jesus not as a merely human being but as God himself come into the world on a mission of mercy that involved the humiliation of a human life and death, it would be this assumed community with common humanity in mode of entrance into and exit from the earthly life which would seem strange and incredible. The entrance of the Lord of Glory into the world could not but be supernatural; his exit from the world, after the work which he had undertaken had been performed, could not fail to bear the stamp of triumph. There is no reason for doubting the trustworthiness of the narratives at these points, beyond the anti-supernaturalistic instinct which strives consciously or unconsciously to naturalize the whole evangelical narrative. The "infancy chapters" of Luke are demonstrably from Luke's own hand, bear evident traces of having been derived from trustworthy sources of information, and possess all the authority which attaches to the communications of a historian who evinces himself sober, careful, and exact, by every historical test. The parallel chapters of Matthew, while obviously independent of those of Luke—recording in common with them not a single incident beyond the bare fact of the virgin-birth—are thoroughly at one with them in the main fact, and in the incidents they record fit with remarkable completeness into the interstices of Luke's narrative. Similarly, the narratives of the resurrection, full of diversity in details as they are, and raising repeated puzzling questions of order and arrangement, yet not only bear consentient testimony to all the main facts, but fit into one another so as to create a consistent narrative—which has moreover the support of the contemporary testimony of Paul. The persistent attempts to explain away the facts so witnessed or to substitute for the account which the New Testament writers give of them some more plausible explanation, as the naturalistic mind estimates plausibility, are all wrecked on the directness, precision, and copiousness of the testimony; and on the great effects which have flowed from this fact in the revolution wrought in the minds and lives of the apostles themselves, and in the revolution wrought through their preaching of the resurrection in the life and history of the world. The entire history of the world for 2,000 years is the warranty of the reality of the resurrection of Christ, by which the forces were let loose which have created it. "Unique spiritual effects," it has been remarked, with great reasonableness, "require a unique spiritual cause; and we shall never understand the full significance of the cause, if we begin by denying or minimizing its uniqueness."

For details see the separate articles on the several distinct topics, e.g., CHRISTOLOGY; GOSPELS; MIRACLES; PARABLES; RESURRECTION; VIRGIN-BIRTH.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

B. I. Limitation of the Field: The means of writing a satisfactory life of Christ have never existed. From the outset what the Church attempted was no more than the story of Jesus covering a twelvemonth. Even in this its object was not historical but apologetic. There exists a bare mention by a few secular writers of 110–120 A.D. of the origin of the obnoxious "Christians." Pliny, the earliest (112 A.D.), merely describes the sect. Tacitus, an accurate historian, c. 115 A.D., dates its rise from the execution of "Christus" by Pilate, procurator of Judea under Tiberius. Secular writers have no more to tell. They would have been compelled to refer inquirers to the tradition preserved by the sect itself. Now even the latest of our four Gospels can be traced in some form by its use in orthodox, heretical, and even anti-Christian writers, to about the same period; so that the whole question of the historical investigator resolves itself into a valuation and comparison of the writings preserved by the Church itself, in the interest of its own defense and edification.

II. The Sources: The story of Jesus included what was needful for the uses of the Church. Fortunately the severest tests known to the science of literary and historical criticism leave the Church in possession of two groups of writings which circulated in Christian conventicles 50–100 A.D. These are (1) apostolic letters, homilies and "prophecies," writings directly addressed to the edification of particular churches; and (2) etiological narratives, purporting to give account of Christian origins.

1. The Epistles of Paul.

Of these sources the former contain from the nature of the case but slight and incidental allusion to the tradition; but for the very reason that no effort is made to prove a case, the readers being merely reminded of generally accepted facts, this testimony, so far as it goes, is of far greater value than apologetic narrative. Moreover, the nucleus of this group consists of extensive "epistles" by a known author addressed at a fixed date to definite localities critically authenticated, and from twenty to fifty years earlier in date than the anonymous narratives. It is needless, in view of this, to explain why the historical critic takes his stand primarily at the situation of belief and practise indirectly revealed by the great Pauline Epistles, employing them as a standard. The minor elements of this group, disputed letters of Paul, later and doubtful writings attributed to Peter, John, James and Jude add little in any event to the knowledge of Christianity as it existed in Corinth c. 55 A.D. derivable from the two Epistles to the Corinthians alone.

2. The Gospels.

The narrative writings (2) are four in number, all anonymous, none earlier than 65 A.D., the latest, attributed in veiled language, in a subsequently attached appendix, to the Apostle John not earlier than 98 A.D. They show a large degree of mutual dependence, but certainly have no mere partial presentation in mind. Each aims to furnish to its respective region "the Gospel" as locally understood inclusive of all essential features. Not in the case of Mark, admittedly representing the tradition as it circulated at Rome, nor even in the case of John, representing that of proconsular Asia, can it be supposed that the writer intended merely to supplement certain standard authorities already current. Just as Mark represents "the Gospel" as understood in Rome, one of the two chief Pauline centers, and John that of Ephesus, the other, so the double work attributed to Luke, whom tradition declared of Antiochian parentage, represents "the Gospel" (Luke i. 4) as understood in "Syria and Cilicia" (Acts xv. 23; Gal. i. 21); while southern Syria, whose historic relations are with Egypt, seems to be represented by the Gospel attributed to Matthew. Critical examination shows these four Gospels to be largely interdependent so that practically the whole of Mark has been transcribed to form the narrative outline of both Matthew and Luke while John shows dependence on all three. Yet in each there persists a significant local type. Both Syrian gospels, besides the conspicuous Mark element, make large use of a factor absent from gospels of the Pauline or Greco-Roman field, that of the commandments of Jesus. This factor (Q) determines the very nature of Matthew, whose whole mission is to teach men "to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you" (Matt. xxviii. 20). Luke's drafts from this same "teaching" source are only second in extent to his extracts from Mark, and are transcribed with much greater exactness. He adds, however, quite a body of narrative not used by Matthew, including his whole second "treatise," and by such additions, as well as the treatment of material, generally approximates more nearly than Matthew to Mark's idea of "the Gospel" as the whole drama of Jesus' career (Acts i. 1). The motive of the Ephesian Gospel is different. While in form largely composed of dialogue, often tending to monologue (iii. 1–21), it does not aim to transmit "commandments of the Lord." Its discourses are controversial expositions of the great Pauline doctrines of new birth, life in the Spirit, etc. Nor does the author aim at history. The "works" he relates are seven symbolic "signs" "manifesting the glory" of the incarnate Logos. The explicit aim is to produce faith in Jesus as the incarnate Son of God, and thus convey that mystical "life" which is the essence of Pauline religion (John xx. 31; cf. Gal. ii. 20).

3. The Pauline Gospel.

The great Pauline Epistles recall the conditions out of which the Greek Gospels have grown. They reproduce not only Paul's own conception of "the Gospel" including an outline of the story, but certain fundamental differences between Paul and the older apostles, which in some degree correspond to and explain the persistent differences of type in the Greco-Roman and the Syrian tradition. Paul was both unable, and of principle unwilling, to compete with those who claimed to report acts and utterances of the Lord from their own observation. Even had he known a flesh and blood Messiah, such a Messiah, were it even the earthly Jesus himself, he would know no more (II Cor. v. 16), because since his experience in conversion, redemption had lost all interest save as a spiritual experience beginning in the individual soul. His own hopeless struggle for the righteousness of the law, on which participation in the Messianic age, the rabbinic "world to come," was in his view conditioned, had issued in a moral death, from which he had been raised by vision of the risen Lord of Stephen and of many another Christian martyr. Dawning faith in the crucified Messiah of the publicans and sinners, outcasts from synagogue orthodoxy, had brought to him not merely hope of a forgiveness without the works of the law, but an experience similar to that he witnessed in them, though of loftier moral type, an influx of life and power from "the spirit." The starting-point of everything was to Paul the risen, glorified Christ, giver of the Spirit. He had been revealed as the Son of God with power by the resurrection (Rom. i. 4). This inward experience made Paul an apostle (Gal. i. 16) and gave him his message. Conference with those who were apostles before him was not needful to prepare him to preach it (Gal. i. 16–17). And yet without the safe anchor of connection with the historic Jesus, this doctrine of a spiritual Christ was exposed to all kinds of vagaries. From what it actually suffered at the hands of docetic Gnostics (see DOCETISM), and of ultra Paulinists like Marcion (q.v.), it seems that it would soon be assimilated in the hands of Greek converts to the myths of the redeemer-gods (*theoi sōtēres*), who, incarnate in the form of demigods, or as invisible eons, "powers," or "emanations," were held to participate in the life of men. The whole ethical content of Paul's religion of the Spirit was dependent on the identification of this Spirit, whose manifestations formed the basis of all church life with "the mind that was in Christ Jesus." Rigidly his converts must be disciplined in the subordination of the spectacular gifts of the Spirit, "miracles," "tongues," "prophecies," to the "abiding," the moral (I Cor. xiii.).

4. Its Relations and Character.

It is no surprise, therefore, to find Paul, three years after his conversion, going up to Jerusalem to "become acquainted with Peter," literally "to hear his story" (Gal. i. 18). From that Petrine story must have come many an allusion in Paul's letters to Jesus' teachings (I Thess. iv. 15; I Cor. vii. 10, ix. 14), the purity of his life (II Cor. v. 21), the tragedy of his betrayal and death (I Cor. xi. 23), the manifestations of his resurrection glory (I Cor. xv. 3–7). From it came certainly the institution of the Eucharist (I Cor. xi. 23–25; see below, II., § 8), but not that of baptism (I Cor. i. 17). Moreover, if it related, as may surely be assumed, marvels of healing and exorcism outshining those of the "strolling Jews, exorcists" and even the "gifts of healing" and "miracles" boasted in the Church (I Cor. xii. 28–29), it is somewhat significant that Paul ignores this whole element, large as it looms on the pages of Mark. Ultimately in the latest of the undisputed epistles Paul states the essence of his Gospel in a "nutshell" (Phil. ii. 4–11; cf. Mark. x. 42–45). Such is Paul's messianism, the starting-point of which is the glorified one of his vision, but in its backward look almost overleaps the earthly career as a mere episode, a period of "humiliation," in the great economy of God, with whom this second Adam had enjoyed the riches of heaven (II Cor. viii. 9) before the first Adam walked in Paradise. Essentially and fundamentally Paul's Gospel is an incarnation doctrine, closely allied in its sacraments, its aspiration to life by mystic union with Christ and God in the Spirit, and even in its terminology, with Greek and Oriental mystery religion. Its soteriology recalls the avatar doctrine of the redeemer-gods (see HINDUISM). That which gives it power to assimilate rather than be assimilated in the maelstrom of intermingling religious ideals, is its ethical root in the life and teaching of the historic Jesus.

5. The Petrine Gospel.

It can not be too emphatically insisted that the gospel of Peter was essentially, in its starting-point, and in religious value, identical with that of Paul (I Cor. xv. 11; Gal. ii. 2, 6–8, 15–16). It also did not start from the story of the ministry, but from the resurrection (Acts iv. 33). It rested upon an experience of Peter only less profoundly ethical than Paul, a rescue by the felt presence of the risen Christ from the abyss of moral agony. The four canonical Gospels have uniformly canceled the story of this fundamental event in the history of the Christian religion in favor of more concrete, more tangible and marvelous tales of the empty tomb and reappearances of Jesus in palpable form. Not a trace of this appears in Paul. His account of the tradition of the resurrection appearances is unassailable, and certainly complete. It puts his own experience in line with Peter's, and coincides with the remnants and allusions in the Gospel narrative of how first of all "the Lord appeared to Simon" (Luke xxiv. 34). Many traces of this initial vision of Peter exist in the canonical story itself (Mark xiv. 28, xvi. 1, cf. ix. 2–10), in additions to it (John xxi. 1–13), in extra-canonical fragments (Gospel of Peter, end), and above all in the recorded prayer of Jesus for the "turning again" of Simon (Luke xxii. 32). These amply corroborate the statement of Paul that the first "appearance" was "to Simon," and establish the essential justice of the tradition which explains the name of "Cephas" or "Peter" ("Rock") as given because the Church owed its foundation to the new-born faith of this disciple. Because Peter in Galilee rallied his "brethren" with the assurance of his experience of a manifestation of Jesus in glory, Christianity became a religion. What was—what is the experience of the presence of the risen Christ? This is not a problem of history but of religious psychology. With Peter's experience, soon repeated in that of his "brethren," of 500 at once, of Pentecost, of James, of Paul (I Cor. xv. 3–8) "the Gospel" began its career. It was essentially the story of the resurrection as a message of redemption (II Cor. v. 19–21). The psychological phenomenon, vital as it is in the spiritual history of the race, falls from its very nature outside the limits of this discussion; yet it alone accounts for the preservation of the implied story of Jesus' previous career.

6. Its Character.

In Peter's case as in Paul's this starting-point was the resurrection. But that which tradition reports (Papias, in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, III., xxxix. 15) of the nature of Peter's preaching is that which could be anticipated from all known of his past. To Peter the remembrance of Jesus' earthly career would not be, as to Paul, a mere episode in the eternal plan of redemption, an avatar of God's redeeming Spirit suffering humiliation and death. It would be a priceless jewel of personal recollections filled with foregleams of the later glorification. Peter's Christology would be fundamentally not an incarnation doctrine, but just as it is actually found in the Petrine speeches of Acts (ii. 32–36, iii. 18–23, 26) an apotheosis doctrine. An early source even sketches the outline of Peter's story. It "began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil, for God was with him." From this point it passes immediately to the story of the crucifixion in Jerusalem and the witness to the resurrection (Acts x. 37–41). The correspondence of this outline with the outline of that Gospel (Mark) which tradition declares to be founded on Peter's narrative, is a phenomenon of great significance. Disregarding the portions elaborated in the Pauline interest, which show connection at many points with Q and perhaps also with the "special source" of Luke, and taking only the underlying narrative, three essential data appear in Mark: (1) the beginnings in Galilee after the baptism of John, including the healings which center in Capernaum, and in fact at the very door of Peter's house (Mark i. 15–39, ii. 1–22, iv. 35, v. 43); (2) the journey to Jerusalem, interpreted by Peter as a Messianic enterprise (Mark viii. 27 sqq., xi. 15 sqq.); (3) the night of betrayal (cf. I Cor. xi. 23), the crucifixion and resurrection (Mark xiv. 16). In all these Peter's figure is central.

7. Consequences.

Two unavoidable inferences from what Paul has shown of Peter's Gospel confirm the tradition which connects the story of Jesus with him. (1) Without the impression of an extraordinary personality and an extraordinary career, the initial experience of Peter, echoed in that of his brethren and of Paul (I Cor. xv. 3–11), the true foundation experience of the Church, could never have occurred. (2) Having occurred, all Peter's remembered intercourse with Jesus would be shot through with transfiguring rays from the later vision of his heavenly glory. The process is artlessly acknowledged in the case of the so-called triumphal entry in John xii. 16. What proved Jesus to have been the Christ whose coming to establish his kingdom only awaits Israel's repentance (Acts iii. 19–26)—this formed the substance of Peter's story.

8. Four Types of Tradition.

Turning to the second and later group of sources, the fourfold tradition, the four canonical Gospels in their fundamental character may fairly be compared with the four tendencies so distinctly marked by Paul among the Corinthian believers of 55 A.D. The Roman Gospel (Mark) recalls those "of Paul," the Ephesian (John) those "of Apollos," the Antiochian (Luke—Acts), those "of Cephas," the Palestinian (Matthew) those "of Christ." Mark and John are both Pauline in the sense of making faith in the person of Christ essential rather than obedience to precept. But in Mark it is the external side of Paulinism which is presented. It appears with the same crudity in its doctrine of the Spirit, and brusqueness in repudiation of Jewish scruples, which calls forth Paul's rebuke of his too inconsiderate adherents in Corinth.

9. The Gospel of John.

The Fourth Gospel systematically idealizes the tradition both of "sayings" and "doings" for the inculcation of a Christology now openly allied to the Logos philosophy of Ephesus and Alexandria. Differences exist among critics as to its authorship, but comparatively none as to its speculative and theological character. Its slender modicum of underlying historic tradition can be employed only with utmost critical caution to criticize or supplement the Petrine story in a few details, so completely has it been volatilized in the dominant interest of presenting Christological theory. Aiming only to depict the drama of the incarnate Logos, this Gospel takes indeed the foremost rank as a source for the later history of Pauline Christology, but is almost unusable for the history of Jesus of Nazareth.

10. Matthew and John.

The two Gospels assigned respectively to Jerusalem and Antioch have much in common after the subtraction of Mark. They do not, with Paul, Mark and John, ignore the Davidic descent of Jesus (cf. Rom. i. 3–4 with Mark xii. 25–37; John vii. 40–43), but prefix independently to the Petrine narrative two genealogies, followed by accounts of Jesus' miraculous birth and childhood. The pedigrees, though mutually exclusive, are really ancient attempts to justify the tradition alluded to by Paul (Rom. i. 3), which possibly had some foundation in the claims of Jesus' family. The stories of the virgin-birth are equally inconsistent with one another, and merely seek in a crude way to adjust the Jewish-Christian doctrine of the pedigrees (Jesus the Christ as son of David) to the Greek or Pauline incarnation doctrine. These also have significance for the history of Christological doctrine, but not for the history of Jesus. The most important new element contributed by Matthew and Luke is the source which they share in common. This was certainly in its fundamental character more closely allied in aim to Matthew than to Luke, its principal object being not to narrate the career of Jesus, but to embody his precepts. If it be supposed that those of Corinth who said "I am of Christ" meant "my conduct is governed by the precepts delivered as from him," their later development may be traced in the combination effected in Matthew, as all critics now admit, of the Gospel of Mark with that primitive compilation of Jesus' teachings made by the Apostle Matthew in the tongue of Palestine, to which Papias refers in 145 A.D. as the "Logia or Syntagma of the Dominical Oracles." The greater leaning of Luke to narrative material, his less intolerant attitude toward teachers and workers of "lawlessness," and the central position accorded to Peter and to the Petrine solution of the great issue at Antioch in his second treatise (Acts xv.; cf. Gal. ii.), justify in classifying the Antiochian Gospel as corresponding to those who declared "I am of Cephas."

11. Q and the Aramaic Source.

It will readily be seen that the most invaluable of all sources for that extraordinary character and career which through its influence on Peter and Paul has given rise to the Christian religion, is the underlying non-Mark element common to Matthew and Luke (Q), whose relation to the reported "Hebrew" compilation (the *Logia*) is as yet unexplained. Unlike the "wonder-loving" Mark, Q is not dominated by the effort to prove by accounts of prodigies surrounding his career that Jesus was the Son of God in the Pauline sense (Mark i. 1), but aims primarily to report his teaching. Even more, while it alludes to Jesus' miracles, as Paul alludes to those of his time, it presents Jesus' attitude toward them as one of severe rebuke of the popular craving for signs (Matt. xii. 38 sqq.; Luke xi. 29 sqq.) as well as of the suggestion that he might violate by his human will the divine order of the world (Matt. iv. 3–7; Luke iv. 3, 4, 9–12). This aim, and this relative independence of Pauline Christology qualify Q, fragmentary as it is, for use as a corrective in relation to the Petrine tradition, much as the Pauline epistles have been used in relation to the fourfold narrative.

The foregoing analysis of the sources in their nature and their relation to one another and to doctrinal development in the Church or its equivalent, is indispensable to every serious-minded modern student of the subject.

12. Results of Source Analysis. The harmonistic method, satisfying to an age which made the equal value and errorlessness of all Biblical writings its point of departure, confronted a relatively simple task. Whatever each evangelist said must be added to, or dove-tailed into, the report of every other. Discrepancies could be ignored or explained away. Variant forms could be attached one after the other, as subsequent similar occurrences or repetitions. To-day the comparative method is displacing the harmonistic. The more vital the subject, the less can the truth-loving and reverent mind be satisfied to exempt it from the most searching analysis possible under the methods of documentary and historical research. The results concern not mere individual anecdotes or sayings, but the traditional story of Jesus as a whole. As already seen, the beginnings of the Christian religion do not deal so much with the career of the carpenter of Nazareth, as with the glorified Lord, whom Paul identified with the redeeming Spirit of God (II Cor. iii. 17), in whom he even sees that semi-personal wisdom which the " wisdom " writers had presented as the agency of God in creation (I Cor. viii. 6; cf. Prov. viii. 22 sqq.; Wisdom of Sol. vii. 21–30). It is this Hellenistic incarnation doctrine which became " Christianity." And yet " Christianity " was saved from absorption in eclectic Gnosticism only by virtue of the persistence of the career and teaching of the historic Jesus, the contribution of the Syrian type of Gospel tradition, whose respective elements " Petrine " and " Matthean " fall now to be analyzed.

It is true that Paul was dependent on Peter; but it is at least equally true that Peter, or more exactly those secondary sources which represent the Petrine tradition, show to an enormous extent the influence of Paul. Only the ultimate substratum of narrative in the Greek Gospels can claim to represent the Aramaic story of the Galilean fisherman. The one source which in its original Aramaic form was comparatively unaffected by Pauline soteriology was the Matthean collection of the " Sayings," which survives only in fragments from a Greek version utilized by Luke in connection with an otherwise unknown narrative source, and by Matthew to complete his manual of " commandments." Even the *Logia* must have started with the presupposition of Jesus' superhuman authority, and, at least in the Greek form, applied to him the apocalyptic title " Son of Man " from Dan. vii. 13.

III. Critical Outline of the Story of Jesus: The task here is to draw from these materials a consistent outline of Jesus' historical career and teaching, determining from these the character of the man, and the nature of the movement which he set on foot " first in Galilee and afterward in Jerusalem."

The story of Jesus began " after the baptism which John preached." (On the infancy chapters of Matthew and Luke see above, I., § 10). The further back the sources are traced the more apparent is it that the movement which Jesus inaugurated was a continuation of that of John, from which the Church subsequently borrowed its rite of initiation.

1. Relations with John the Baptist. Great stress is laid in the earliest source (Q) on the distinction between John's ascetic life, emphasizing his stern warnings of judgment and wrath to come, and that of Jesus, who came into the populous haunts of men with his winning proclamation of forgiveness. The latest source (John) is deeply concerned to show how void of all significance was the whole Johannine movement, except as premonitory of the Gospel. And yet the true relation is evident in the reverential regard of Jesus for John, in whose movement he saw no less a matter than the great repentance, to be effected according to Scripture " before the great and terrible Day of Yahweh " (Q, Matt. xi. 2–19, xii. 41, xxi. 32; Luke vii. 18–28, 31–35, xi. 32, xvi. 14–16). Equally apparent is it in the fundamental note of Petrine story, which begins with Jesus' coming into Galilee after John's arrest, with an invitation to the fishermen to join him in gathering men, rescuing the strayed sheep of the flock of Israel. There is all the less reason to doubt the statement that Jesus had been himself baptized by John, inasmuch as later evangelists experience great difficulty in adjusting this fact to their doctrine of Messiah's sinlessness (Matt. iii. 13–15; Gospel of Hebrews, fragment 3).* But the so-called Prologue of Mark (i. 1–13), wherein this scene is depicted on the basis of the Jewish legend of the anointing of Messiah by Elias, with employment of the voice from heaven of the transfiguration apocalypse (see below II. 7) does not belong to the basic Petrine tradition, which begins at verse 14 (cf. Acts x. 37).

2. The Motive for Jesus' Ministry.

The real impulse under which Jesus took up the standard of the martyred prophet and carried it away from the wilderness into the centers of half-heathen Galilee, is clearly apparent from his invitation to the fishermen (with Mark i. 17 cf. Jer. xvi. 16, and Matt. xiii. 47), and kindred utterances from Q (Matt. ix. 35–38, x. 6, xviii. 12–14; Luke x. 2, xv. 3–7). It is made even more unmistakable in the special source of Luke, in which the humanitarian and sociological aspect of Jesus' work is strikingly emphasized. Synagogue religion under the domination of the scribes had in fact made it almost impossible for the " people of the land " to expect any " share in the world to come." The spiritual inheritance of Israel as a whole had been monopolized by the scribes and their devout followers the Pharisees. The ideal since even the times before the monarchy (Ex. iv. 22; Hos. xi. 1) had been that Israel was to be a people of God's " sons." Now none were allowed to be so reckoned who did not " do the will," as revealed in the sacred law and interpreted by the scribes. The Johannine movement as interpreted by Jesus (Q, Matt. xxi. 32 = Luke vii. 29) was a protest against this usurpation. The rite of baptism itself, foreign as it is to the Mosaic code, and spontaneous in its symbolism, justifies this view of the movement of John. The epithet " friend of publicans and sinners," flung at Jesus by his foes the synagogue authorities, the scene of his early ministry, the very class in society to which he belonged, make it apparent that the beginning of Jesus' ministry in Galilee had exactly this character of protest in the name of the " little ones " whose poverty alone would have made the yoke of the law, ever heavier as the scribes were making it, a yoke which in Peter's words (Acts xv. 7) " neither we nor our fathers were able to bear." It was sociological, and ethico-religious.

---

* In John i. 32–34 the baptism and voice of adoption become a mere manifestation to John and Israel. The Logos is of course already conscious of his nature and mission.

3. Message and Miracles.

Jesus did more than merely carry on the baptism of John. He renewed John's preaching of repentance in view of the coming kingdom, but instead of awaiting in the wilderness those whom curiosity or conscience might drive to him, he carried the message where the lost sheep of Israel were most numerous. He enlisted the aid of fishermen, publicans, wage-earners like himself to proclaim it. He went from Capernaum to the towns of Gennesaret, from Gennesaret to the villages of Galilee. He preached in the synagogues and in the streets. Baptism itself was for the time being left behind, since physical conditions made it impracticable. The message also was infinitely bolder, and at the same time infinitely more hopeful than John's. Fortunately much of it is preserved in substantially original form. The repentance itself of the sinful was to Jesus a proof of that divine forgiveness for the attainment of which the repentance had been demanded (Matt. xxi. 28–32 = Luke xv. 11–32, vii. 36–50). He declared in the name of the great Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that there was access to him, forgiveness, adoption, life in the kingdom, for those who " did the will "; not in the sense of scribe and Pharisee, but by simple imitation of the spirit of the loving God of nature (Q, Matt. v. 43–48 = Luke vi. 27–36). He welcomed such to spiritual brotherhood with himself (Mark iii. 35 and parallels). Inward, not outward, purity was made the condition of " seeing God "; and the essence of the law simple-hearted devotion to God, and God-like goodness to one's fellow men, " even to the unthankful and the evil." This was much more than all whole burnt-offering and sacrifice. The immense effect of Jesus' preaching was not due alone to the reawakening in the land of the voice of prophetic authority, with its moral imperative, " thus saith the Lord "; but to certain startling accompaniments, which at their first appearance were the occasion to Jesus of one of his vigils of prayer (Mark i. 35–39), but were ultimately welcomed by him as a divine aid and seal upon his proclamation of forgiveness. His stern rebuke of an outcry from a " possessed " person in the synagogue in Capernaum resulted in an involuntary exorcism. The " demon " went out. In Peter's house immediately after, a " healing " took place on the appeal of the inmates that he would lay hands upon the patient. Straightway Jesus was besieged with the importunities of the sick in body and mind, with the result that he appears divided between the desire to give physical help, and the vivid appreciation of the danger involved of being forcibly diverted from his higher aims. A whole cycle of marvels of healing and exorcisms, even the subduing of the demons of wind and storm, appears at this point of the Petrine tradition. Q, with more sobriety, presents Jesus' attitude on the subject in contrast with the malignant interpretation of the scribes. The " mighty works " are the evidence of God's gracious intervention to overthrow the power of Satan. Such evidence would have led Tyre and Sidon, Sodom and Gomorrah, to repentance; but to that hardened generation they were simply an occasion of " stumbling in him." In point of fact he was accused by leading scribes of collusion with Beelzebub.

4. Breaking of Bread.

Before relating the irrepressible conflict with the scribes into which Jesus was led by his championship of the " people of the land," a few words must be devoted to a cycle of narratives presented in duplicate by Mark and Matthew, occupying a central position in every one of the Gospels. The chief feature of these is the feeding of the multitude. They owe their conspicuous position, as appears from the features on which they dilate, to their etiological significance, as explaining and defining the order of the church rite of the breaking of bread; and the very existence from earliest times of this institution, with its significant name of Agape or Love-feast (qq.v.; Acts vi. 4; I Cor. xi. 20–34; Jude 12), proves the fundamental historicity of the tradition. True, Mark's narrative is controlled by the idea of a prodigy outstripping the miracle related of Elisha in II Kings iv. 42–44, and the later evangelists follow this lead. Still the original motive is different. It inculcates that wonderful spirit of absolute abandon in self-denying service which formed one of the primitive " gifts of the Spirit " (I Cor. xiii. 3; Acts ii. 44–46, iv. 32–37), and which was rightly attributed to the influence of Jesus. The multitude gathered about Jesus in the wilderness had hung upon his words until the hour of the evening meal. Yet instead of dismissing them to find shelter and food as they best could in the neighboring villages, as the disciples urged, Jesus directed that the whole stock of their common resources be set before them. He not merely made the multitude thus materially his guests, but took them formally into the very circle wherein he was himself wont to act as house-father, " blessing and breaking the bread." The results in even a physical sense seem to have filled his followers with amazement, but became far more memorable after Jesus on a later occasion had exemplified the same spirit in the surrender of his very life-blood. Paul is the witness (I Cor. xi. 24) that on the night of his betrayal Jesus asked the continuance of this custom of the breaking of bread as a fitting memorial of the life which was being laid down to open the kingdom of heaven to the spiritually disinherited.*

---

* In I Cor. xi. and John vi. the two rites, agape and Eucharist, are inextricably interwoven; for church practise had already taken this inevitable course. But in Luke xxiv. 35 men who know nothing of the latter recognize the practise of the former.

5. Collision with the Authorities.

Invasion of the domain of synagogue authority by such a movement as that of the prophet of Nazareth could not fail to provoke a violent reaction. This became apparent first in the murmurs of the Galilean Pharisees at the disregard shown by his followers for set fasts, ceremonial ablutions, and even for the Sabbath. Jesus deprecated iconoclasm, but insisted on the prior right of " the greater matters of the law, judgment, mercy and good faith." Local orthodoxy was reenforced by a delegation of " scribes from Jerusalem." These, when their unworthy ascription of the healings wrought " by the Spirit of God " to Beelzebub had been rebuked by Jesus, openly challenged his authority to teach, and demanded a prophet's authentication by " sign from heaven." Jesus' reply was a noble repudiation of such criteria in favor of God-given " signs of the times." He denounced the usurpation by the scribes of the right to admit to or exclude from " sonship," and their pretensions to be solely qualified to reveal " the Father." Against them he appealed to the " inward light." He thanked the infinite " Lord of heaven and earth " that his truth was not given to the wise and prudent, but to minds as simple as babes. As representative and champion of the " little ones " he even declared that real knowledge of the Father belongs to him who has the filial spirit; while the Father reserves to himself alone the right to say who is a son (Q, Matt. xi. 25–27 = Luke x. 21–22).*

6. The Crisis in Galilee.

But the Jews required a sign. The scribes remained masters of the field. Whether because of popular desertion, or the threatening attitude of Antipas, whose secret murder of John the Baptist at Machaerus falls at about this period (Mark vi. 14–29; cf. Luke xiii. 31–35), Jesus' public work in Galilee is from now on abruptly broken off. He remains in hiding on the northern frontier until, after secretly rallying his adherents in Capernaum, he undertakes with them the last emprise. The ultimate decision was made at Cæsarea Philippi, near the ancient Dan. Jesus consulted his few remaining followers as to his own career. The campaign must either be abandoned, or else reopened on a larger, but far more perilous scale. The impetuous Peter, so Petrine tradition relates, broached at this time the daring proposal of an actual Messianic *coup d'état* at Jerusalem. It was met by Jesus with a rebuke of crushing severity. He did indeed propose to attack the central seat of hierocratic usurpation, to vindicate in the temple itself the right of all the people to their own national sanctuary, now perverted into a mere instrumentality of extortion by a godless band of " robbers." Jesus was contemplating the throwing down of a gage of battle, in the face of the degenerate priestly aristocracy whose only relic of the splendid heritage of Maccabean sovereignty was the citadel of the temple. But he would do so in the name only of " the things that be of God." Zealot nationalists should not seize the reins to pervert his movement into a mere fruitless insurrection against the Romans. Once turned in this direction the result to himself, his followers, his cause, as he could not but foresee, would be inevitably fatal. Of the imminence of this danger he warned them, once and again. Yet withal, in the spirit of that unconquerable faith in God which they had learned to know as his most distinctive trait he assured them that even if—as was only too probable—shipwreck did thus come of all their earthly hopes, even if they lost their lives for his sake and the Gospel's, they should find them again. Within the lifetime of that unworthy generation should come his vindication in the great " day of the Son of Man " of Danielic vision.

7. Jesus as " Son of Man."

In the light of later conviction this assurance of divine vindication in the Messianic judgment came to be interpreted as a prediction by Jesus that he himself would come again as the Son of Man. This term is already consistently employed in the oldest evangelic source (Q) as a self-designation of Jesus, though not yet in Paul. From Q it passes to Mark and thence to the entire evangelic tradition, creating the wrong impression that Jesus was a visionary (*Ekstatiker*), carried away with the apocalyptic enthusiasm of the early post-resurrection conventicles. In reality his ideal was ethico-religious; and the integrity and unswervable fidelity of his simple, straightforward purpose ought to have made it impossible in the present to impute to him a perversion from this ideal. In spite of Jesus' crushing rebuke, a later element of the Palestinian Gospel (Matt. xvi. 17) makes Peter's suggestion of Messiahship at this time the foundation of the Church. Jesus, it is said, declared it a *bath ḳol*, or revelation from God. Parallel to this prose statement is the apocalypse or " vision " story of the transfiguration, interjected by Mark in ix. 2–10 from some Pauline source of the symbolic type represented in John. Jesus was " metamorphosed " (cf. II Cor. iii. 18) before the eyes of Peter, James and John into his glorified form, while the translated " witnesses of Messiah," Moses and Elias, stood beside him. The voice of God then declared his true character. This again, it need hardly be said, belongs to the history of Christological doctrine; not to the story of Jesus.

8. The Finale.

The exodus from Galilee was accomplished secretly. The little body of those who were willing to leave all and follow Jesus to possible martyrdom went by way of the Jordan valley, Peraea and Jericho. At this last stage of the journey it received an encouraging accession, whether the story of Mark is followed or the " special source " of Luke. Shortly before Passover, Jesus entered the temple, surrounded by a motley company of enthusiastic, yet orderly supporters. The priestly authorities were overawed. The most obnoxious of abuses inaugurated in the sanctuary by " the hissing brood of Annas " was abolished, peremptorily, and yet without mob violence. In answer to the challenge of the sanhedrin Jesus gave as the sign of his authority " the baptism of John," a movement " from heaven and not of men." He had succeeded in averting the danger of Messianistic outbreak, and asserted the religious rights of the "lost sons" in the central sanctuary, without affording a just pretext for Roman intervention. But his success was short-lived. He had to deal with a hierocracy which had no scruples about defending its supremacy by intrigue and midnight assassination; a Roman governor notorious for his ruthless harshness and readiness to shed innocent blood; and for support the broken reed of a fickle populace, ready at a moment's notice to forsake the champion of their rights in the kingdom of God. The tragedy as related by the first witnesses has but a single act—"the night in which he was betrayed." The scenes of that night, the last supper with its warning of the end, its pathetic "memorial," Gethsemane, the arrest, with desertion of the twelve, sequestration of Jesus till the morning in the high priest's house, Peter's denial and flight, show a vividness unequaled elsewhere in the Gospel story. All that follows is relatively vague and self-contradictory. Trial was impossible from time conditions alone. It could only prove self-stultifying to the accusers, if attempted. Annas and his fellow conspirators were far too shrewd to involve themselves in such public responsibility. They merely "delivered over" Jesus to Pilate as a Messianistic agitator. It may well be believed that Pilate put no faith in the disinterestedness of such accusers, and even that he hesitated at another judicial murder. But he soon discovered that the popularity of Jesus was less formidable than the pressure of synagogue authorities and priestly aristocracy. Jesus' conscience-stricken disciples emerged from their hiding-places to hear the awful issue. On the day before the Passover, as the priests had planned (Mark xiv. 2), Jesus was crucified. The accusation was written as custom prescribed upon his cross. He died as having aspired to the throne of David. Friendly but unknown hands accorded him hasty burial.

---

* For the generic use of " the son " cf. John viii. 35. For the being known ("recognized") of God, cf. Gal. iv. 9; II Tim. ii. 19.

9. The Issue.

Such is the career whose outline critical analysis dimly discerns beneath the tradition of the Church. The vindication came, though not as Jesus expected it. The throne to which he had not aspired was given him by the love and faith of humanity. There was a "turning again" when the influence of Jesus, whether by the reaction of memories of the past, or in direct spiritual intervention from the unseen world, reawakened the faith of Simon Peter, and Christianity began, founded in devotion to the risen and glorified Lord. BENJAMIN W. BACON.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature is enormous and the following is no more than a selection aiming to direct to the most useful works from various points of view. The literature cited is exclusive of works on the teaching, work, and character of Jesus, and on special topics or phases of his life, trial, death, resurrection, and ascension. A bibliography carrying all these and other topics is: S. G. Ayres, *Jesus Christ Our Lord; an English Bibliography of Christology comprising over 5,000 Titles annotated and classified*, New York, 1906; cf. W. B. Hill, *A Guide to the Lives of Christ for English Readers*, New York, 1905 (gives evaluation of thirty-six lives of Christ). Volumes which review discussions of the life and works of Christ are: A. Schweitzer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede, Eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, Strasburg, 1906 (reviews the attempts up to date to write the life of Jesus); H. Jordan, *Jesus im Kampfe der Parteien der Gegenwart*, Stuttgart, 1907; F. Spitta, *Streitfragen der Geschichte der Jesu*, Göttingen, 1907; W. Sanday, *Life of Christ in Recent Research*, New York, 1907; H. Weinel, *Jesus im 19. Jahrhundert*, Tübingen, 1907 (a review of the work of the century); G. Pfanmüller, *Jesus im Urteil der Jahrhunderte*, Leipsic, 1908.

Possibly the earliest attempt at a systematic life was that in a series of *Meditationes vitae Christi* attributed to Bonaventura, Eng. transl. by W. H. Hutchings, New York, 1881; a corresponding effort in English is Jeremy Taylor's *Great Exemplar of Sanctity and Holy Life*, London, 1649 (devotional). A new period opened with J. G. von Herder, *Erlöser des Menschen* and *Von Gottes Sohn*, in his *Christliche Schriften*, Riga, 1794–98 (the first notable works to apply scientific research). Stadia were marked by H. E. G. Paulus, *Das Leben Jesu*, Heidelberg, 1828 (rationalistic); D. F. Strauss, *Das Leben Jesu*, 2 vols., Tübingen, 1835–36; Eng. transls., e.g., 3 vols., London, 1846, and *Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk*, Leipsic, 1864, Eng. transls., London, 1879 (advanced the mythical theory and evoked a storm of protest and a large number of replies); A. Neander, *Das Leben Christi*, Gotha, 1837, Eng. transl., London, 1846 (one of the earliest and best answers to Strauss); E. Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, Paris, 1863, Eng. transls., frequent eds., e.g., New York, 1904 (more appreciative than Strauss of historical verities, but yet so stressed the legendary that it evoked as much opposition as Strauss's work); T. Keim, *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, 3 vols., Zurich, 1867–72, Eng. transl., 6 vols., London, 1873, new ed., 1897 (critical, rationalistic, yet to be reckoned with). It may be serviceable to the historical student to know that the *British Museum Catalogue* gives in the entries under each of these notable works the titles of replies or criticisms which they evoked. While the works just named in a way mark stages in the study, the lives which follow are those which are of chief value among the very large number of works on the life of Christ; F. W. Farrar, *Life of Christ;* with an appendix, 2 vols., London, 1874 (popular); C. Geikie, ib. 1876; E. De Pressensé, London, 1879; J. Stalker, Edinburgh, 1879; A. M. Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, New York, 1882; A. Edersheim, London, 1883 (utilizes rabbinic sources); S. J. Andrews, New York, 1884 (one of the best in English); B. Weiss, 2 vols., Berlin, 1884, Eng. transl., 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1884; G. Dalman and A. W. Streane, *Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar, and the Liturgy of the Synagogue*, texts and transl., London, 1893; A. Robinson, *A Study of the Saviour in the Newer Light*, London, 1898 (critical but reverent); G. Matheson, *Studies in the Portrait of Christ*, 2 vols., London, 1900 (sympathetic and spiritual); R. Rhees, .New York, 1900 (concise); O. Holtzmann, Tübingen, 1901, Eng. transl., London, 1904; N. Schmidt, *The Prophet of Nazareth*, New York, 1905 (critical, of high value); D. Smith, *The Days of His Flesh*, London, 1905 (highly esteemed); A. Whyte, *The Walk, Conversation and Character of Jesus Christ, Our Lord*, Edinburgh, 1905 (brilliant and original); W. Bousset, *Jesus*, Eng. transl., London, 1906 (a judicial consideration of the testimony of the Gospels); A. Réville, 2 vols., Paris, 1906 (critical); W. Sanday, *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, 2d ed., Edinburgh, 1906. For the critical literature on the sources see under GOSPELS; PAUL THE APOSTLE; and under the articles on the separate Gospels.

JESUS CHRIST, BROTHERS OF. See JAMES, I., 3, §§ 1–2.

JESUS CHRIST, MONOGRAM OF.

I. Christ.
  Different Forms (§ 1).
  Date of Origin (§ 2).
  Symbolism (§ 3).
II. Jesus.
III. Jesus Christ.

"Monogram of Christ" is the term usually applied to a combination of the first two letters of the Greek word for Christ (XP), although it is also given to an abbreviated form of the name Jesus as well as to a synthesis of both.

I. Christ: The monogram for "Christ" shows two chief forms, the "rho" being either placed

1. Different Forms.

within the "chi" (☧), or the latter being set upright and the former superimposed on that arm, which thus becomes vertical (⳨). Two additional forms were given by the reversal of the "rho" (☧, ⳨), and the addition of a horizontal line at right angles to the "rho" in the first of the main types gave yet another pair of monograms (☧, ☧). There are also a number of less usual forms, as when the Latin "r" is substituted for the Greek "rho," which is found in Syria (420), Gaul (after the middle of the fifth century), and Italy (chiefly at Ravenna and on a tombstone at Milan).

The form ⳨ is exclusively Christian, although it closely resembles the Egyptian *ankh* (☥), the symbol of life, which is twice altered into the Christian monogram in an inscription of the sixth century from the island of Philæ, where it marks the transformation of a temple into a church. The monogram ☧, on the other hand, is pre-Christian, and appears on Attic tetradrachms, on Ptolemaic coins, and in an inscription to Isis of 138–137 B.C., while in Greek manuscripts of the Christian period it forms an abbreviation of various words.

2. Date of Origin.

It has long been a problem whether the monogram for the name of Christ was introduced by the Emperor Constantine or was in use before his time. The inscriptions with this symbol to which appeal has been made in confirmation of the latter hypothesis are either spurious or extremely doubtful. The oldest Roman epitaphs of certain date which bear the monogram ☧ are of 323 and 331, both in the reign of Constantine, while the earliest dated monument from Gaul is in 347. Yet since a monogram was made for the name Jesus in the second century, it would seem that the name Christ underwent the same process, and that Constantine adopted a form which was already current. This is confirmed by the fact that ☧ as an abbreviation for "Christ" is found in certain inscriptions of the third century. The monogram occurs with great frequency in the inscriptions on Christian graves, sometimes alone and sometimes with the "alpha" and "omega" (see ALPHA AND OMEGA), with the fish, between two doves, between palm-branches, in a garland, in a circle, and the like. It is found throughout the Greek and Roman world, as well as among the Copts and in Germany. Nor is it confined to inscriptions, but occurs on funeral lamps, glass vessels, sarcophagi, wall-paintings, ornaments, and even on clothing and other articles of daily life. The two main forms of the monogram long existed side by side, and occasionally occurred on the same monument, but in the fifth century ☧ gradually yielded to ⳨, and both finally gave place to the simple cross.

The Emperor Constantine placed the monogram, apparently in the form ☧, on his standard and helmet, as well as on the shield of his soldiers, and its use was very frequent on the coins of his successors (except Julian) until Justinian I. (d. 565), when it was replaced by the cross. In the second half of the fourth century the monogram was placed on public buildings, the earliest dated instance being from Sion (Switzerland) in 377. It was likewise employed in the churches, the oldest example being a mosaic in the Church of St. Constantia at Rome, where it appears in a scroll in the hand of Christ. In the remarkable church of the Savior at Spoleto, which dates probably from the second half of the fourth century, the monogram ☧ occurs on the great arch above the altar, while the ⳨ is found on the tympanum of two side-windows of the façade. Other structures showing the monogram are the temple on the banks of the Clitumnus (apparently transformed into a church in the fifth century), Sta. Maria Maggiore in Rome (fifth century), and Sta. Francesca Romana in the same city (twelfth or thirteenth century).

3. Symbolism.

In epitaphs the monogram is either used as a simple abbreviation of the name Christ, or, if isolated grammatically, denotes confession of Christ. In early art it stands as a symbol of Christ, as when he is typified on a sarcophagus in the Vatican grottos by a lamb which stands on a mount (Rev. xiv. 1) and bears the ⳨ on its head. It is likewise associated with the human figure of Christ, a single monogram being placed either above his head or in a halo, while in other cases one is represented on each side of his head. When set between two persons on glass vessels, the monogram symbolizes the presence of Christ in their midst. Particularly interesting is the symbolism frequently found on sarcophagi which represents the monogram ☧ in a garland sustained by a flying eagle above the cross, at the feet of which appear the guardians of the grave. Here the lower portion typifies the crucifixion and the repose of the tomb, while the upper part is an emblem of the resurrection and ascension. The monogram appears also as a purely symbolic figure, as when a tombstone of 355 represents a man holding the ⳨ in his outstretched right hand.

II. **Jesus:** The oldest form of the monogram for the name Jesus is the Greek $\overline{\text{IH}}$, which is implied in the Epistle of Barnabas ix., where in the 318 men circumcised by Abraham (a combination of Gen. xvii. 23 with xiv. 14) is traced an allusion both to Jesus ($\overline{\text{IH}}$) and to the cross (T), the Greek mode of writing 318 being *ιητ′*, an interpretation which passed to the Latin Church. The employment of this monogram in ancient Christian monuments, however, is rare, although it is found in the catacomb of Priscilla and in the atrium of the so-called *Capella Græca*. In the Occident the form IHS has been extremely wide-spread since the end of the Middle Ages, this being due especially to the sermons of Bernardin of Sienna, who used to display at the close of the addresses which he delivered in various cities a tablet containing these letters written in gold and surrounded by the rays of the sun. This monogram later became the special emblem of the Jesuits.

III. **Jesus Christ:** The simplest form for the combination of both the divine names in Greek is ✳, consisting of the initials I X. This monogram, though ancient, is rare, but is found on a tombstone from Rome in 268 or 279, and on others from Gaul in 491 and 597. It likewise occurs between the "alpha" and "omega" (bronze lamp in the museum of Estense) and in a circle (above a throne in the center of a sarcophagus at Tusculum). The form is occasionally modified to ⳩, especially in graffiti of the catacomb of St. Calixtus, while a Gallic gravestone of 498 shows the three forms ☧, ⳩, and ⳨. The monogram occurs also in the mosaics of several churches of Ravenna.

The usual abbreviation of the two names in the oldest manuscripts of the New Testament is $\overline{\text{I C}}$ $\overline{\text{X C}}$, which is also found in the Neapolitan catacombs, while in the Greek Church it was frequently placed on the base of the paten. It appeared on the coins of the Byzantine emperors from John Zimiskes (969–975) to the fall of the dynasty, and was also employed in Greek paintings and sculptures, as well as on the bronze doors of 1070, formerly in the church of St. Paul at Rome. Particularly noteworthy is the transfer of this monogram to the medieval Latin Church. In the ancient church of St. Peter at Rome were mosaics of the time of Innocent III., which represented Christ enthroned between Peter and Paul with the inscription $\overline{\text{I C}}$ $\overline{\text{X C}}$, while similar mosaics are still preserved from the early part of the fourteenth century in the church of Sta. Maria Maggiore at Rome. Italian easel-pieces of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries likewise show this form of the monogram. The Latin form of the monogram for Jesus Christ was $\overline{\text{IHS}}$ $\overline{\text{XRS}}$, which occur in the earliest Latin manuscripts of the Bible, the first two letters of each part being expressly declared to be Greek and the last Latin. In the Occident this form was used from the earliest times in inscriptions, sculptures, and paintings, especially in miniatures of the Carolingian period and in medieval panel-paintings, while it was placed on Byzantine coins from Basilius Macedo (867–886) to Romanus Diogenes (1068–71). (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: *Spicilegium Solesmense*, ed. J. B. Pitra, iv. 505 sqq., Paris, 1858; E. le Blant, *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule*, vol. i., passim, ib. 1856; G. B. de Rossi, *Inscriptiones christianæ urbis Romæ*, vol. i. passim, Rome, 1861; R. Garrucci, *Storia della arte cristiana*, i. 163 sqq., Prato, 1881; F. X. Kraus, *Real-Encyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer*, ii. 125 sqq., 412 sqq., Freiburg, 1886; V. Schultze, *Archäologie der altchristlichen Kunst*, pp. 235 sqq., Munich, 1895; *DCA*, ii. 1310–14; C. M. Kauffmann, *Handbuch der christlichen Archäologie*, pp. 295 sqq., Paderborn, 1905; H. Leclercq, *Manuel d'archéologie chrétienne*, ii., 383 sqq., Paris, 1907; F. Cabrol, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne*, i. 178 sqq., Paris, 1903.

JESUS CHRIST, PICTURES AND IMAGES OF.

- I. The Oldest Views and Data on the External Appearance of Jesus.
  - The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (§ 1).
  - The Church Fathers (§ 2).
  - Other Data (§ 3).
- II. Literary Data on the Oldest Pictures of Jesus.
- III. Extant Pictures of Jesus.
  - 1. Portraits Ostensibly Authentic.
    - Portraits by Painters, Sculptors, etc. (§ 1).
    - Alleged Supernatural Pictures (§ 2).
  - 2. Pictures of Jesus in Ancient Art.
    - Symbolical and Allegorical Representations (§ 1).
    - Representations as Teacher and Lawgiver (§ 2).
- IV. Origin of the Pictures of Jesus.

I. The Oldest Views and Data on the External Appearance of Jesus: Neither the New Testament nor the writings of the earlier post-Biblical Christian authors have any statements regarding the personal appearance of Jesus, thus contrasting sharply with the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha and especially with the works of the Gnostics. In the "Shepherd" of Hermas (ix. 6, 12) the lofty stature of the Son of God is emphasized, and according to the Gospel of Peter he even towered above the heaven at his resurrection. Gnostic influence is betrayed by visions in which Christ appears as a shepherd, or the master of a ship, or in the form of one of his apostles, as of Paul and of Thomas, or again as a young boy. In the Acts of Andrew and Matthew he assumes the figure of a lad, and the same form is taken in the Acts of Peter and Andrew, in the Acts of Matthew, and in the Ethiopic Acts of James. Manazara is healed by a youth in the Acts of Thomas, and a beautiful lad appears to Peter and Theon in the *Actus Vercellensis*, which also mentions the smile of friendship in the face of Jesus. A handsome youth with smiling face appears at the grave of Drusiana in the Acts of John, but certain widows to whom the Lord restored their sight saw him as an aged man of indescribable appearance, though others perceived in him a youth, and others still a boy. The youthfulness of Christ is also mentioned in the life and passion of St. Cæcilius, and the passion of Saints Perpetua and Felicitas ascribed to the risen Christ the face of a youth with snow-white hair.

1. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

2. The Church Fathers.

The early Christian authors were by no means concordant in their opinions of the personal appearance of Jesus. Some, basing their judgment on Isa. lii. and liii., denied him all beauty and comeliness, while others, with reference to Ps. xlv. 3, regarded him as the most beautiful of mankind. To the former class belong Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Basil, Isidor of Pelusium, Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Cyprian. Origen declared that Christ assumed whatever form was suited to circumstances. It was not until the fourth century that Chrysostom and Jerome laid emphasis upon the beauty of Jesus. While Isidor of Pelusium had referred the phrase, "Thou art fairer than the children of men" in Ps. xlv. 2, to the divine virtue of Christ, Chrysostom interpreted the lack of comeliness mentioned in Isa. liii. 2 as an allusion to the humiliation of the Lord. Jerome saw in the profound impression produced by the first sight of Jesus upon disciples and foes alike a proof of heavenly beauty in face and eyes. From the insults inflicted upon Jesus Augustine concluded that he had appeared hateful to his persecutors, while actually he had been more beautiful than all, since the virgins had loved him.

The problem of the external appearance of Jesus possessed but minor interest for the Church Fathers,

3 Other Data.

although the Catholic Acts of the Holy Apostles ascribe to him an olive complexion, a beautiful beard, and flashing eyes. Further details are first found in a letter to the Emperor Theophilus attributed to John of Damascus (in *MPG*, xcv. 349), which speaks of the brows which grew together, the beautiful eyes, the prominent nose, the curling hair, the look of health, the black beard, the wheat-colored complexion, and the long fingers, a picture which almost coincides with a hand-book on painting from Mt. Athos not earlier than the sixteenth century. In like manner, Nicephorus Callistus, who introduced his description of the picture of Christ (*MPG*, cxlv. 748) with the words, "as we have received it from the ancients," was impressed with the healthful appearance, with the stature, the brown hair which was not very thick but somewhat curling, the black brows which were not fully arched, the sea-blue eyes shading into brown, the beautiful glance, the prominent nose, but brown beard of moderate length, and the long hair which had not been cut since childhood, the neck slightly bent, and the olive and somewhat ruddy complexion of the oval face. A slight divergence from both these accounts is shown by the so-called letter of Lentulus, the ostensible predecessor of Pontius Pilate, who is said to have prepared a report to the Roman Senate concerning Jesus and containing a description of him. According to this document Christ possessed a tall and handsome figure, a countenance which inspired reverence and awakened love and fear together, dark, shining, curling hair, parted in the center in Nazarene fashion and flowing over the shoulders, an open and serene forehead, a face without wrinkle or blemish and rendered more beautiful by its delicate ruddiness, a perfect nose and mouth, a full red beard of the same color as the hair and worn in two points, and piercing eyes of a grayish-blue. The unauthentic character of this letter is admitted by all.

II. Literary Data on the Oldest Pictures of Jesus: (1) A handkerchief embroidered with the figures of Jesus and his Apostles, and made, according to legend, by his mother, is said to have been seen by the monk Arculfus during his residence in Jerusalem (Adamnan, *De locis sanctis*, i. 11 [12]). (2) In his account of his visit to Cæsarea Philippi, Eusebius mentions (*Hist. eccl.* vii. 18) a group of statuary in brass which consisted of a kneeling woman and a man standing with his hands stretched out toward her. Local tradition saw in this a figure of Jesus and the woman healed of an issue of blood, who was said to have come from Cæsarea Philippi. This legend was accepted by Eusebius, Asterius Amasenus, Photius, Sozomen, Philostorgius, and Macarius Magnes, the last-named calling the woman Beronike. The actual meaning of the group is uncertain. Some have seen in it an emperor and a province, possibly Hadrian and Judea, while others have regarded it as Æsculapius and Hygeia, a view which is vitiated by the fact that no mention is made of the serpent-staff characteristic of statues of the god of healing. It is entirely possible that the group actually represented Christ and either the woman with an issue of blood or possibly the woman of Canaan who implored him to heal her daughter. (3) According to Irenæus (*Hær.*, I., xxv. 6), pictures of Christ were possessed by the Gnostic sect of Carpocratians, who crowned them with garlands like the pictures of philosophers—Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and others—while, according to the Carpocratians, Pilate had a portrait of Jesus painted during his lifetime, and the Carpocratian Marcellina possessed a picture of Christ which she honored, like those of Paul, Homer, and Pythagoras, with prayer and incense. (4) The Emperor Alexander Severus had a picture of Jesus; it must have been, however, only an ideal portrait, like those of Apollonius, Abraham, Orpheus, and others, which were also included in his lararium (Lampridius, *Vita Alex. Sev.* xxix.). (5) A brass statue of the Savior was erected by Constantine the Great before the main door of the imperial palace of Chalce (Theophanes in *MPG*, cviii. 817). (6) A picture of Jesus "painted from life" was possessed by the Archduchess Margaret which may be the same one as Dürer's altar-piece of St. Luke at Brussels (M. Thausing, *Dürer*, p. 420, Leipsic, 1876).

While the portraits just mentioned were prepared by human agency, there were others to which a supernatural origin was ascribed. To this category belong (7) a picture at Camulium in Cappadocia, apparently on cloth and perhaps a copy of that of Edessa (see below). It was mentioned at the second Nicene Council and was carried to Constantinople by Justin II., where it was regarded as so sacred that a special festival was instituted in its honor, and it was frequently carried in war as a potent icon (*J. Gretsei opera*, xv. 196–197, Regensburg, 1741). (8) In the war against the Persians the General Philippicus had a picture of Christ which the Romans believed to be supernatural in origin, and the same portrait served to quell a mutiny in the army of Priscus, the successor of Philippicus. This icon was apparently on cloth, and was a copy of an original which was frequently confounded with a portrait in Amida, although the latter is expressly said to have been painted, and was, consequently, natural in provenience (Zacharias, *MPG*, lxxxv. 1159). (9) A Syriac fragment mentions a picture of Jesus painted on linen and found unwet in a spring by a certain Hypatia shortly after the Passion. This portrait left a miraculous imprint on the napkin in which it was wrapped, and one of these pictures found its way to Cæsarea while the other was taken to Comolia (possibly identical with the city of Camulium already mentioned), although a copy was later found at Dibudin (?) (Lipsius, *Die edessenische Abgarsage*, p. 67, n. 1, Brunswick, 1880). (10) About 570 a linen mantle was shown at a church in Memphis which bore the impress of the Savior's face and was so bright that none could gaze at it (Antoninus Martyr, *De locis sanctis*, xliv.). (11) Byzantine literature frequently mentions pictures of Christ impressed on bricks. According to a legend which presents several slight variations, the portrait of himself which Jesus had sent to Abgar at Edessa was believed to have been walled up to save it from the attack of

King Ananun and to have been rediscovered in 539 together with a brick which bore a miraculous copy of the original (Georgius Cedrenus, ed. Bekker, i. 312, and others). (12) The patriarch Germanus, when forced to leave Constantinople, is said to have taken with him a picture of Christ which later came into the possession of Gregory II. (G. Marangoni, *Istoria dell' oratorio di San Lorenzo*, pp. 78 sqq., Rome, 1747). (13) The cloth with a picture of Christ presented by Photius to the hermit Paul at Latro in the ninth century was merely a copy of a miraculous original, although only he to whom the gift was made was able to perceive the portrait, others seeing only the cloth (Gretses, ut sup. p, 186). (14) More important than all other statements concerning the oldest pictures of Christ is a passage of Augustine (*De trin.* viii. 4), stating that the portraits of Jesus were innumerable in concept and design.

1. Portraits by Painters, Sculptors, etc.

III. Extant Pictures of Jesus. 1. Portraits Ostensibly Authentic: (1) The paintings of Luke, of which the best known are two at Rome. One of these is in the chapel Sanctus Sanctorum, although the statement that Luke painted a portrait of Jesus dates only from medieval times, the monk Michael, the biographer of Theodore of Studium, being one of the earliest sources. In the last quarter of the twelfth century the legend of Luke was interwoven by Wernher of Niederrhein with the tradition of Veronica (see below). Luke, in answer to Veronica's entreaties, is said to have made repeated attempts to portray Christ, but his endeavors were unsuccessful. Jesus then impressed the image of his face upon the handkerchief of Veronica. Another picture ascribed to Luke and painted on cloth is in the Vatican library, while a third is said to have been placed in the cathedral of Tivoli by Pope Simplicius. Other pictures are likewise ascribed to a similar provenience, and very late traditions even attribute statues of Christ to the chisel of Luke. [In the church of San Miniato at Monto, in the environs of Florence, Italy, is shown a portrait of Christ, attributed to Luke.] (2) To Nicodemus is ascribed a statue of the crucified Christ carved in black cedar and preserved in the Cathedral of Lucca. Its design shows that it dates at the earliest from the eighth century, although tradition states that the model of Nicodemus was furnished by the impress of the Savior's body on the linen cloths purchased to cover the corpse at the descent from the cross. (3) A " true and only portrait of our Savior taken from an engraved emerald which Pope Innocent VIII. received from Sultan Bajazted II. for the ransom of his brother, who was a captive of the Christians," frequently reproduced in photograph, is in reality the copy of a medal which may have been cut at the command of Mohammed II., and which is, at all events, of comparatively modern date. (4) The mosaic in the Church of St. Praxedis in Rome, which is exhibited on festal occasions, is by no means one of the earliest Christian mosaics, although tradition regards it as a present to Pudens from the Apostle Peter.

2. Alleged Supernatural Pictures.

Alleged supernatural pictures may be divided into those which represent the entire figure of Jesus, and those which give only his face. (1) Cloths of medieval date containing more or less clear outlines of the figure of a man, all claiming to be the " napkin " in which Jesus was wrapped in the grave and on which his image was impressed, were formerly found in Chambéry, and, until the end of the eighteenth century, in Besançon, while they still exist at Compiègne and Turin, the latter " napkin " being declared authentic by a bull of Sixtus IV. Far more famous, however, are the cloths which bear only the impress of a head or face and of these one of the best known is (2) the picture of Edessa, or the Abgar picture. According to the Doctrine of Addai and Moses of Choren, Hanan, the envoy of the king of Edessa, painted a portrait of Jesus and took it to his royal master. Evagrius, on the authority of Procopius, states that Christ sent to the king a picture of miraculous origin. The legend apparently arose about 350, and may well have been based on an actual painting which remained at Edessa till 944, when it was brought to Constantinople by the Emperor Romanus I. Its subsequent fortunes are uncertain, although various cities laid claim to its possession, especially Genoa, Rome, and Paris, the first-named city advancing the most probable arguments for authenticity and receiving the confirmation of Pius IX. (see ABGAR). This picture shows only the head of Jesus, but legend also knows a full-length Edessene portrait on linen produced by contact with the body of Christ. It is mentioned by Gervase of Tilbury in the beginning of the thirteenth century, who bases his statement on ancient sources and says that it was exhibited on festivals in the chief church of Edessa, and that on Easter it shows Jesus successively as a child, boy, youth, young man, and in the ripeness of years. (3) One of the choicest treasures of the Roman Church is the handkerchief of Veronica, which is shown only on special occasions, particularly in Passion Week. This portrait is said to have been transferred in 1297 by Boniface VIII. from the Hospital of the Holy Ghost to St. Peter's in Rome, where it reposes behind the statue of St. Veronica. The picture, which is now much faded, shows an elliptical face with a low-arched forehead, in marked contrast with the long nose. The mouth is slightly open, and the scanty hair is visible only on the temples. The beard on the cheeks is thin, but is stronger on the chin, where it ends in three points, while the mustache is more conspicuous for color than for strength. The eyes, arched by scanty brows, are closed, and, combined with features distorted by agony and stained with blood, complete the picture of a martyr pale in death. From the point of view of esthetics and the history of art, the picture is probably Byzantine. Although one would expect the picture of Veronica to be regarded as the napkin which covered the head of Christ, there is no tradition as to its origin, although a mass of medieval legends connects it with the name of a woman. These may be divided into two classes. In the older group, apparently written shortly before the ninth century, Veronica appears as the woman afflicted with an issue of blood, who had a portrait of Jesus either painted by herself or at her bidding, or else impressed by Christ himself upon a piece of cloth. The second form of the legend sprang up in France and Germany in the course of the fourteenth century and superseded the older version before 1500. According to this tradition, Veronica gave the Savior a handkerchief on his way to Golgotha, and received it back impressed with his features. Further amplifications of the tradition stated that the napkin was brought to Rome by John VII., or even during the reign of Tiberius, while it is certain that Celestine III. prepared a reliquary for it. At all events, what is clear is that during the medieval period Rome possessed a cloth picture of Christ, which was apparently supposed to be the miraculous impress of the head of Jesus in the sepulcher. It is significant, moreover, that it bore the name *sudarium* before the rise of the legend of the handkerchief given Christ to wipe his face on his way to the cross, nor was it until the twelfth century that the name of Veronica even began to form a part of the tradition, a connection suggested by a popular etymology of Veronica as *Vera* εἰκών ("true image"). This legend of Veronica gave rise to a tendency of art which reached its culmination in Dürer, who represented the napkin of Veronica and the Savior with a crown of thorns, combining the suffering in the face of Jesus with the loftiness and the majesty of the Son of God. (4) The picture of Christ in the apse of St. John Lateran at Rome is supposed to have been miraculously produced when the church was dedicated by Pope Sylvester, although it is in reality a mosaic of recent date.

1. Symbolical and Allegorical Representations.

2. Pictures of Jesus in Ancient Art: In the course of time pictorial representations of Jesus became either real or symbolical and allegorical, the latter tendency gradually giving way to the former. To the category of symbols belong the fish, the lamb, the various monograms of Christ, and the Good Shepherd, the last-named leading to representations of Jesus in human form. As early as Tertullian the Good Shepherd adorned chalices, and it was a favorite form of decoration in the catacombs, where the figure usually carries a goat or a wether. In these pictures, often adorned with other animals, trees, and shrubs, and based on Luke xv. 5; John x.; and Ps. xxiii., the Christ appears only in youthful guise, although the Shepherd is usually clad in garments of a higher rank and wears the Roman tunic and the pallium as well as sandals. The figure, moreover, is Latin instead of Oriental in type, and represents a youthful and beardless, sometimes even boyish, figure, a round head with curling hair, and a frank face with regular features. This type of picture, purely ideal as it was, underwent evolution in the course of time. In the third century the face grew more oval, while the unparted hair grew slightly over the forehead in the center and flowed on the sides in wavy or curly locks.

2. Representation as Teacher and Lawgiver.

The first real impulse, however, to artistic representations of Jesus was given by his miracles, though the risen Lord as a teacher and a lawgiver became more and more a subject for pictorial representation. In the midst of all or a part of his disciples, including Paul, Christ appears either on a plain, as in Spain and southern France, or standing on a mountain either within or without the four rivers of Eden, or sitting on a throne with his feet on a footstool or on the clouds, while mosaics represent him as seated on the celestial globe. As a teacher, he is depicted as speaking and as holding a book or scroll either in his hand or on his bosom, while as a lawgiver he proffers the Gospel to Peter or Paul. In both of these latter categories, the beardless, youthful type gradually grows less frequent, so that on Roman, Upper Italian, and French sarcophagi the central Christ appears bearded, although in the reliefs on their sides he wears no beard, the former representing the risen Lord and the latter the earthly Savior. Originally a characteristic of the ascended Christ, the beard was attributed to Jesus during his earthly ministry after the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century. The struggle between the two types is seen in the mosaics of Sant'Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna and of St. Michael, but the earliest specimen of the bearded Christ is generally believed to be the so-called Callistinian mosaic which was found in the catacomb of St. Domitilla. In conformity with the manhood implied by the beard, the body increased in height and breadth, while the features became more sharply defined as the bones gained in accentuation over the flesh. The nose became longer and more prominent, and the eyes were deeper and their pupils enlarged, while the angles of the nose and mouth were more sharply outlined. The hair, while frequently less curling than hitherto, was now represented as falling to the neck and shoulders, and was often parted in the middle. The color both of the hair and of the beard varied through all shades from yellow to gray and black. The upper lip was never clean-shaven, and the beard was sometimes close and sometimes either pointed or rounded, the parted type being found only in rudimentary form in early Christian art.

The bearded Christ represents the climax of the art of early Christianity, and the fifth century ushered in a period of decay marked by all manner of exaggeration. Majesty became stiffness, exaltation unapproachability, and earnestness gloom. Thus the Christ of Saints Cosmas and Damian (q.v.) in Rome, dating from the sixth century, is a figure with long face, projecting cheek bones, ashen complexion, attenuated nose, mane-like hair, and scanty beard.

It was the task of the Middle Ages to reduce the multiplicity of concepts of the likeness of Christ to unity, a task which required centuries for its completion. The Carolingian period saw a sort of fruitless recrudescence of the process of evolution of the early Christian period. Even during the Renaissance the beardless type struggled for supremacy with the bearded, especially in miniatures and ivories, but the former steadily lost ground, so that its last sporadic occurrence is a Scandinavian Christ in glory of the thirteenth century, such pictures as the *Pietà* of Botticelli at Munich being mere anachronisms.

IV. Origin of the Pictures of Jesus: While the theory may be advanced that the oldest pictures of Christ were based either on works of art still more ancient or on tradition, it is practically certain that they are not real portraits but ideal representations. This is clear both from their extreme diversity and from the words of Augustine: "What his appearance was we know not." The most primitive type, wherein early Christian and Gnostic documents agree, is that of a boy or youth. The youthful vigor of the early Church in religious and in moral thought, sustained by the belief in the second coming of the Lord and strengthened by persecution, inspired the artist to depict the Christ as the incarnation of undying youth, even as Noah, Job, Abraham, and Moses were represented as beardless boys. Herein, too, lay the genesis of the concept of the Good Shepherd.

With the fourth and fifth centuries the bearded type was evolved side by side with the beardless. The explanation of this change lies in the perfection, strength, and manliness implied by the beard. The parted hair, on the other hand, which is characteristic of the pictures of Christ in this period, especially in the mosaics, typifies his earthly lineage and designates him as one of the children of Israel, since of human beings only Jews and Judeo-Christians are represented with parted hair in early Christian art. The theory, advanced by many scholars, that Greek religious art influenced the various early Christian concepts of the personal appearance of Christ seems to lack sufficient evidence to be in any wise conclusive.

(NIKOLAUS MÜLLER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. Bayliss, *Rex regum. A Painter's Study of the Likeness of Christ from the Time of the Apostles*, London, 1903; A. N. Didron, *Iconographie chrétienne. Histoire de Dieu*, Paris, 1843; W. Grimm, *Die Sage vom Ursprung der Christusbilder*, pp. 121–175, Berlin, 1844; Mrs. Jameson, *History of our Lord as Exemplified in Works of Art*, 2 vols., London, 1872; A Hauck, *Die Entstehung des Christustypus in der abendländischen Kunst*, Heidelberg, 1880; T. Heaphy, *Likeness of Christ*, New York, 1886 (illustrations valuable); H. M. A. Guerber, *Legends of the Virgin and Christ, with Special Reference to . . . Art*, ib. 1896; E. M. Hurll, *Life of Our Lord in Art*, Boston, 1898 (valuable); E. von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, Leipsic, 1899; F. W. Farrar, *Life of Christ as Represented in Art*, London, 1900; J. L. French, *Christ in Art*, Boston, 1900; F. Johnson, *Have We the Likeness of Christ*, Chicago, 1903; J. Burns, *The Christ Face in Art*, New York, 1907; J. S. Weis-Liebersdorf, *Christus- und Apostelbilder*, Freiburg, 1902; J. Reil, *Die frühchristlichen Darstellungen der Kreuzigung Christi*, Leipsic, 1904; K. M. Kaufmann, *Handbuch der christlichen Archäologie*, Paderborn, 1905; G. A. Müller, *Die liebliche Gestalt Jesu Christ, nach der schriftlichen und monumentalen Urtradition*, Styria, 1909.

JESUS CHRIST, THREEFOLD OFFICE OF: A phrase connoting the functions of Christ as prophet, priest, and king. From the earliest times Jesus has been recognized as the representative of a twofold and yet unitary theocratic function, as king and priest. The spiritual kingdom of the Messiah has its foundation in the sacrifice of his life (Matt. xvi. 16–25, xx. 25–28). This thought may be traced from the second century to the time of the Reformation. But as early as Eusebius a threefold office is ascribed to Christ, that of prophet, priest, and king, and this is traceable to Jewish sources. The view of a threefold office, however, did not suppress the tradition of a twofold office, although the three designations of Christ were always used separately. Among the medieval theologians, Thomas Aquinas approaches closely the conception of Eusebius since he speaks of *legislator*, *sacerdos*, and *rex*, but with him this is merely a mechanical division, and Thomas makes no further use of the threefold scheme. The Evangelical doctrine followed in the beginning the tradition of a twofold office (cf. the works of Luther and the older Evangelical catechisms). Calvin added the prophetic office as a third function, and his conception of the doctrine of Christ's work became the basis for its treatment in Reformed theology and soon also in Lutheran theology. As prophet the Messiah brings the full light of intelligence and thus becomes the fulness and consummation of all revelations. As king of a spiritual and eternal kingdom he not only brings his people external and passing aid, but equips them especially with the gifts for eternal life and guards them against their enemies. As priest Christ secures to his people by his atonement and vicarious suffering the blessing that God deals with them not as judge, but as gracious father. In accordance with these principles Calvin emphasized the truth that communion with God is found in Christ's living personality and in life communion with that personality. In the Heidelberg Catechism (Questions 31 and 32) the thought of Calvin received a finished form and found a large circulation. The orthodox followers of Calvin, however, attempted both to explain the full content of the Messianic person from three points of view, and to analyze the act of salvation in its historical development according to the threefold scheme, thus not easily escaping the mistaken assumption that Christ had become first prophet, then priest, and finally king. It became the custom to deprive Christ of his royal function in the state of humiliation and of the prophetical function in the state of exaltation. Against this mechanical tendency, Cocceius opened new and fruitful points of view by returning to the living material of the Bible. The usual order of the offices of Christ seemed to him justified in so far as the dignity of Christ rose in the growing mind of the people, from the state of a prophet to that of a king. But in reality, he states, Christ's priesthood must be put in the first place, since even before time he mediated between his Father and the people; then follow the royal and prophetic offices. The first office is that through which Christ acquires his people; the second that through which he keeps them; and the third that through which he leads them to the knowledge and love of the king. This double consideration would have resulted in an organic and simultaneous union of the offices in the living personality, even if Cocceius had not expressly added that the entire mediatorial act lasted until the end of days.

Historical Survey.

The Roman catechism also teaches the threefold office of Christ. In Lutheran theology the doctrine was adopted only at a late period. Melanchthon had not left to the school of theology which followed him a uniform system as Calvin had left for Re-

In Lutheran Theology.

formed orthodoxy. The interest in the individual reception of justification drew attention from an all-sided objective observation of Christ and his gifts. There was even a tendency to reduce the twofold office of Christ to a single function. According to Melanchthon and Hesshusen, Christ is before everything priest; even as king he exercises essentially priestly functions. Selnecker seems to have been the first who used the formula of a threefold office, but his exposition is governed also by the priesthood of Christ, to which the two other offices are related like introduction and conclusion. Others again, like Gerhard, tried to identify the priestly and prophetical offices. Hemming and Nicolaus Hunnius taught that the office of the king was supreme and that it comprehended the other two functions. Everywhere the same concentration upon one point is found. In the mean time, however, Hafenreffer and especially Gerhard had directed their attention to the idea of a threefold office as advocated by Eusebius and Calvin. Gerhard not only used the new expression, but tried to prove that only the sum of the three offices offers the fulness of Christ's benevolent gifts. In the *regnum potentiae* he found a specific function for the royal office. Since the middle of the seventeenth century, after the old Melanchthonian scheme of dogmatics had been replaced by an objective and historical arrangement of the material, there was room for a coherent representation of the work of Christ, which was systematized according to the threefold office. There was a reaction of the old Lutheran sentiment in 1773 when Ernesti criticized the reigning doctrine because he could not see why the clear and sufficient designation of the work of Christ as *satisfactio* should be obscured by metaphorical phrases. Moreover, he was of the opinion that the different offices were not clearly separated from each other, so that one title might justly cover all of them. Other dogmaticians after him raised similar objections on the ground that neither the prophetical nor the royal office stands upon equal footing with the priestly office, but that both point to the atonement which is included in it. But the majority of recent dogmaticians adhere to the scheme of a threefold office. Schleiermacher took the lead in this tendency by attempting the successful proof that the three offices in their indissoluble union completely define and circumscribe the character of redemption as accomplished by Christ. With the exclusion of the prophetic office, he holds, the clear consciousness of the believer would be superseded by a magical mediation of salvation. Without the royal office, there would be lacking the relation of the individual believer to a community. Finally, the absence of the priestly office would rob the foundation of Christ of its religious content.

Interpretation and Significance of the Doctrine.

The doctrine of Christ's threefold office represents the redeemer as the fulfiller of all Old-Testament prophecies and thus of all needs of the human being. Everything that Israel expected of its future salvation had concentrated itself more and more in the hope of the Messiah, "the anointed of God" (John i. 41, iv. 25). He was thought of as the king who was to restore the glory of David's kingdom. In the course of time the prophet, who as successor of Moses was never to be wanting among God's people (Deut. xviii. 15), became identical with the Messiah (John vi. 14–15). The third office is reflected in the picture of the Messiah in Isa. liii. God's people can feel themselves secure only when all conflict of the theocratic offices is excluded by unity and every blessing of salvation is to be found in one single person (Heb. vii. 23 sqq.). There was a longing especially for the solution of the frequent historical conflict between kingdom and priesthood (I Sam. ii. 35; Zech. vi. 12 sqq.). A priest-king after the manner of Melchizedek was hoped for (Ps. cx. 4). All these elements were combined in the idea of the Messiah who was to possess the spirit of God in many-sided fulness and as the power of a comprehensive redeeming activity (Isa. xi. 1 sqq., lxi. 1 sqq.; cf. Luke iv. 18 sqq.; John iii. 34). The anointing with the spirit mentioned in these passages has the significance of the anointing of kings, priests, and to a certain extent also of prophets in so far as they were endowed with the charismata. By confessing Jesus as Christ, the Christian congregation expresses that it finds in him the performer of all activities which secure salvation to the people of God. Jesus is king (Matt. xxi. 5, xxvii. 11), prophet (Matt. xxi. 11; Luke vii. 16), and high priest (Heb. ii. 17, iii. 1). The scheme of the threefold office permits of arranging the Biblical material in its original connection, as it belongs to a complete representation of the person of Christ. Its systematic value becomes evident only from the proof that for the fulfilment of the Messianic activity there is necessary nothing more and nothing less than the functions designated by it. The three offices of prophet, priest, and king correspond to the needs of the moral education of man and of his connection with human society and the surrounding world. If the activity of Christ on earth were restricted to atonement, it would not be possible to speak of the perfection of the human being in connection with Christ. It is a matter of course that in every moment of his earthly and heavenly activity Christ exercises at one and the same time all his offices. Socinianism claims for the entire activity of Christ on earth only the prophetical office in order to reserve the other functions as faint ornaments for the state of exaltation (Racovian Catechism, §§ 191 sqq., 456 sqq.). The permanent union and simultaneous exercise of the three functions do not exclude, however, a fixed aim, namely, the kingdom. To this as the organizing purpose of the whole points before everything the Biblical basis of the formula, the starting-point and essential content of the Messianic office is royal dominion over and for God's people, the peculiar modification of which is described by the other titles.

(E. F. Karl Müller.)

Bibliography: For history of the doctrine consult: H. L. J. Heppe, *Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantismus im 16. Jahrhundert*, pp. 209 sqq., 222 sqq., Gotha, 1857; idem, *Dogmatik der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche*, Elberfeld, 1861; A. Schweizer, *Glaubenslehre der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche*, vol. ii., Zurich, 1847; H. Schmid, *Dogmatik der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche*, Frankfort, 1876; A.

Ritschl, *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, i. 520 sqq., iii. 394 sqq., Bonn, 1882–83, Eng. transl., of vol. i., Edinburgh, 1872. For exposition of the doctrine consult the literature under DOGMA, DOGMATICS; WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY.

JESUS CHRIST, TWOFOLD STATE OF: The doctrine dealing with the humiliation and exaltation of Christ. Christian faith has always spoken of a humiliation and exaltation of Christ when it compared the earthly appearance of Jesus on the one side with the mode of existence of the preexisting Logos, and on the other side with the present world-rule of the Mediator. But the formula of a twofold state has been coined only in connection with the definite interpretation given to the incarnation by Luther and the Christological theory that followed in his steps. From the dogmatic idea of the unchangeableness of God and of the communication of divine attributes to the human nature of Christ there results a terminology which must make room in the earthly life of the Redeemer for a human development, otherwise inconceivable, by a special " state of humiliation." Incarnation denotes, accordingly, not a descent of the Logos, but an elevation of human nature, which has been received into the most intimate connection with the divine nature. In virtue of the Communicatio Idiomatum (q.v.) which began with his incarnation, it was impossible for Christ to rid himself of his divinity. With the incarnation the exaltation of human nature to divine glory was completed once for all. " When he [Christ] began to be a man, he also began to be God " (Luther). According to Brenz, the real ascension of Christ began with the incarnation. " Divine nature," however, " can neither be humiliated nor exalted." The life of Jesus within the limits of human development rests, therefore, upon that act of self-limitation of the God-man—not of the Logos—which is described in Phil. ii. 5–9. In this way the state of self-renunciation is brought about. The exaltation or " majesty " of Christ was self-evident, but the great problem to be solved was how humiliation was possible.

The Lutheran Doctrine.

Johann Gerhard among the Lutheran theologians most fully developed the doctrine of the two states of Christ. The communicatio idiomatum, according to him, was accomplished at the moment of incarnation, but Christ did not make use of them, he renounced them, he took upon himself the form of a servant, until he ascended to heaven and sat on the right hand of God; hence the distinction between the state of self-renunciation and the state of exaltation. The state of humiliation, therefore, does not denote the unconditional lack and absence of the divinity and majesty communicated to the flesh, but only the retraction and intermission of its use. In 1616 there originated a controversy between the theologians of Giessen and those of Tübingen (see CHRISTOLOGY, IX.) as to the manner in which Christ emptied himself (see KENOSIS) of his divine attributes, whether it was mere concealment (Gk. *krypsis*) or an actual emptying (*kenōsis*). The orthodox theologians did not consider the self-renunciation of Christ mere simulation, but a true and real self renunciation of the plenary communicated divine majesty and virtue. There arose also a question as to the time when the state of self-renunciation began. According to Luther's interpretation of Phil. ii. this state began only after the birth of Jesus. After his birth Jesus might have exalted himself above men, if he had not been willing to serve them. But according to the later dogmaticians the state of humiliation began with the conception. Since humiliation, however, does not consist in the assumption of human nature, but in the assumption of the form of a servant, incarnation is distinguished from its incongruous form—the incarnation of the Logos is not his humiliation but an exaltation of human nature, while the act of conception is the first act in the humiliation of the God-man. The state of exaltation begins with the descent of Christ into hell as the triumph of the God-man over the devil (see DESCENT OF CHRIST INTO HELL).

The Reformed Doctrine.

For Reformed theologians the doctrine of the twofold state of Christ is of minor dogmatic importance; their attention was concentrated not so much upon the dogmatic assertion of the unchangeableness of God as upon the practical Biblical view of the truly human development of Jesus. According to the Reformed doctrine the Logos himself is the subject of the *kenōsis* described in Phil. ii. In this way it was impossible for the Reformed to avoid contradiction with the dogma of the unchangeableness of God. In reference to Phil. ii. they accepted the Lutheran doctrine that the Logos did not assume human nature in general, but the form of a servant, and by identifying incarnation with Christ's obedient conduct until his death on the cross, the Reformed were able to speak of a humiliation of the God-man. The exaltation beginning with the resurrection actually extols human nature to a higher stage.

Development. Modern Teachings.

Within Protestant orthodoxy the treatment of the doctrine of states has led to a tendency to dissolve the theory of the two natures in its scholastic form. On the Lutheran side the true humanity of Christ became inconceivable, on the Reformed side there was at least proposed the full revelation of God in Christ. Holding to the orthodox standpoint of the unchangeableness of God, the Lutherans could not make conceivable the humiliation of Christ, while the Reformed could not explain the full and essential connection of God with the humiliated Christ. By their efforts to satisfy merely the immediate religious needs, in consonance with the practical and empirical spirit of modern times, theologians like Ritschl have discarded altogether the doctrine of states, holding that we must not transcend the simple belief that the man Jesus stands over against us on the side of God. Thus they simply cut off all insoluble questions concerning the relation of the eternal to the earthly son of God, and accordingly there is no need to speak of a special state of humiliation. But the development not only of the thought, but of practical faith results in the recognition that the truth of God's appearance in the flesh must in the end suffer if this side of the doctrine of states is discarded. In this connection the question of preexistence can not be discussed, but it is to be remembered that the Biblical passages relating to it confirm an actual participation of God in the revelation in Christ. God's self-offer in Christ becomes conceivable only by the humiliating sacrifice of the eternal son for sinful humanity. Passages like John iii. 16; I John iv. 9; Rom. viii. 31–32; Gal. iv. 4 testify that in Christ we have the living and decisive expression of divine love, not merely a historical phenomenon which assures this love. As to the interpretation of Phil. ii., there has been brought forth only one really exegetical reason which apparently excludes the relation of that passage to the descent of Christ from heaven. It has been pointed out that the apostle desires to give in Christ an example of humiliation which is imitable. But this objection may be refuted if it is considered that the imitation of Christ in the sense of the New Testament does not always mean an actual appropriation of his actions in their essential quality, but simply the mode and manner of his actions and sentiments so that he, like God himself, may be an example in matters which are not imitable in their essence (Eph. v. 25; I Pet. iii. 13, 18–19; Matt. v. 45; Eph. v. 1–2). See CHRISTOLOGY.

(E. F. KARL MÜLLER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. J. Van Oosterzee, *Christian Dogmatics*, ii. 494 sqq., New York, n.d.; J. H. Ebrard, *Christliche Dogmatik*, vol. ii., Königsberg, 1852; F. A. Philippi, *Kirchliche Glaubenslehre*, vol. iv., Gütersloh, 1885; A. B. Bruce, *Humiliation of Christ in its Physical, Ethical and Official Aspects*, New York, 1887; J. Köstlin, *Luthers Theologie*, Stuttgart, 1901; W. A. Brown, *Christian Theology in Outline*, pp. 332–336, New York, 1906; and the literature under COMMUNICATIO IDIOMATUM.

JESUS THE SON OF SIRACH, WISDOM OF. See APOCRYPHA, A, IV., 12.

JETZER, yet′ser, **JOHANNES:** Journeyman-tailor and religious impostor; b. at Zurzach (16 m. n.n.e. of Aarau) in the canton of Aargau, c. 1483; d. after 1520. In 1506 he entered the Dominican monastery of Bern as lay brother. He is described as uneducated, morally depraved and deceitful, even suspected of theft. On Mar. 24, 1507, according to his story, St. Barbara appeared to him and a few days afterward the mother of God to announce that she had been indeed conceived in sin, as the Dominicans taught. To prove the truth of her divine revelations, she impressed upon him in repeated visits the stigmata of Christ, and now Jetzer began to act the story of Christ's sufferings in the church in lively manner. The monastery, whose picture of Mary shed bloody tears, attracted large crowds of people, and sold with great success handkerchiefs moistened with the blood. But doubts arose, and in July the bishop of Lausanne undertook an investigation which came to nothing. Subsequently the magistrate of the town investigated the case. Jetzer was imprisoned and tried; after various denials he confessed that the whole affair was an imposture in which the four head-masters of the monastery, Johannes Vatter, Dr. Stephan Boltzhurst, Franz Uelschi, and Heinrich Steinegger, were implicated. The matter was immediately reported to Rome and after a competent jury had been instituted, the culprits were tried under torture. In 1509 the four monks were condemned and burned alive as blasphemers, and Jetzer disappeared. The scandal caused great sensation and indignation, especially at Bern. A large literature of pamphlets in Latin, German, French, and Dutch told the scandalous story and confirmed the general verdict concerning the corruption of monastic life.

(E. BLÖSCH†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. Rettig, *Die Urkunden des Jetzerprozesses*, in *Archiv des historischen Vereins des Kanton Bern*, vol. xi., 1886; R. Paulus, *Ein Justizmord an vier Dominikanern begangen*, Frankfort, 1897.

JEWEL, JOHN: Bishop of Salisbury and a noted defender of the Reformation settlement in England; b. in the parish of Berimber, Devonshire, May 24, 1522; d. at Monkton Farleigh (2 m. n.w. of Bradford), Wiltshire, Sept. 23, 1571. He went first to Merton College, Oxford, and then, winning a scholarship, to Corpus Christi College, taking his bachelor's degree in 1540. Two years later he was elected to a fellowship at Corpus Christi. During his university life he was strongly influenced in the direction of Biblical criticism by John Parkhurst, his tutor, and confirmed in a general Protestant attitude by Peter Martyr, who came to Oxford in 1547. Some time before 1551 he took orders, and about the end of that year became vicar of Sunningwell, near Oxford. On the accession of Mary in 1553 he lost his fellowship, and ultimately, after seeking peace even at the cost of signing articles which he did not believe, was forced to flee. He arrived at Frankfort in March, 1555, but soon joined Peter Martyr at Strasburg, and followed him to Zurich in the following year. On receiving the news of Queen Mary's death he started for England, arriving there in March, 1559, and was made bishop of Salisbury Jan. 21, 1560. He was active in preaching and in the visitation of his diocese, and soon took a prominent place in the controversy with Rome. His *Apologia pro ecclesia Anglicana* (London, 1562) has been called "the first methodical statement of the position of the Church of England against the Church of Rome." By it Jewel secured acknowledgment as the official champion of Anglicanism. He was engaged for several years in an exchange of controversial works with Thomas Harding, an old Oxford contemporary, who supported the papal cause. All his writings are noted for learning, clarity, and precision. Of his works, which are all deliberate, scholarly, and logical, a complete edition was published in 1609. Modern editions are those by R. W. Jelf (8 vols., Oxford, 1848) and another in 4 vols., published by the Parker Society (Cambridge, 1845–50).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The original biography was by L. Humphrey, *Joannis Juelli . . . vita et mors*, London, 1573, and was condensed by D. Featley in the *Memoir* prefixed to the *Works*, 1609; a second condensation was prefixed to an ed. of the *Apology* and the *Epistle to Scipio*, London, 1685, reproduced in C. Woodsworth, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, ib. 1853. These lives were the basis of that by C. W. Le Bas, ib. 1835. A *Memoir* is prefixed also to the Parker Society ed. of the *Works*. Consult further: *DNB*, xxix. 378–382; J. H. Overton, *The Church in England*, i. 459–461, ii. 36–37, London, 1897; W. H. Frere, *The English Church* (1558–1625), passim, ib. 1904; and in general the works on the history of Jewel's time.

JEWS. See ISRAEL, HISTORY OF.

JEWS, MISSIONS TO THE.

I. In the Primitive Church.
II. In the Roman Catholic Church.
  Early Missions (§ 1).
  Missions in Spain (§ 2).
  Missions in Other Countries (§ 3).
III. In Protestant Churches.
  Lutheran and Reformed Churches (§ 1).
  English Missions (§ 2).
  Minor English Missionary Societies (§ 3).
  Missionary Societies in Other Countries (§ 4).
  Missions in the United States (§ 5).
IV. Methods and Practical Considerations.
  Methods in Christian Lands (§ 1).
  Methods in Non-Evangelical Countries (§ 2).
  Influence of Zionism on Jewish Missions (§ 3).

I. In the Primitive Church: Although the kingdom of God which Christ had come to realize was to extend, according to the predictions of the prophets, not only over Israel, but over the whole earth, Jesus had, nevertheless, restricted his personal activity to Israel; and had even commanded his disciples not to go in the way of the Gentiles (Matt. x. 5). It was not till he was about to depart from the earth that he commanded them to teach and baptize all people. The Twelve, however, directed their efforts primarily to the Jews; and the earliest Christian congregations were composed entirely of Jews and proselytes to Judaism. Apostolic missions among the Jews were so successful that James could point out to Paul thousands of converted Jews (Acts xxi. 20). A large number of priests were also obedient to the faith (Acts vi. 7); and in the congregations which Paul founded in Asia Minor, Greece, Crete, etc., the nucleus was Jewish. That the conversion of the Jews was not lost sight of in the second or third century is proved by the dialogue of Justin Martyr with the Jew Trypho and Tertullian's *Adversus Judæos*. But Jewish Christianity had long developed a heretical tendency by insisting upon the national and religious peculiarities of Judaism and by avowing the most pronounced Gnosticism. The further growth of the Jewish element in the Church would have seriously endangered her inner life and existence, if the insurrection of Bar Kokba had not led to a sharp separation of Judaism from the universal catholic character of the Church. Deprived of their political power and national autonomy, the Jews concentrated their whole spiritual life upon the study of the Law and produced the Talmud. The transformation of prophetism into Talmudism created a wide gulf between Jews and Christians. From the very beginning, the spirit of the Talmud drew a veil over their eyes (II Cor. iii. 13–16).

II. In the Roman Catholic Church: **1. Early Missions.** The early church did not possess any special institutions for the conversion of the Jews, although there were always those whom the love of Christ compelled to preach the Gospel to the Jews, and there were likewise other factors which made it advisable for the leaders of both Church and State to win the Jews for Christianity. Cassiodorus, when he became a monk, felt himself constrained, in his exegesis of the Psalms (as in his *conclusio* to Ps. lxxxi.), to urge the Jews to be converted. So the Emperor Justinian, from political motives, stated that the purpose he had in ordering the synagogues to use the Greek and Latin translations of the Old Testament, and to abstain from Talmudic exegesis, was to lead the Jews to Christianity. Bishops did not hesitate to resort to acts of violence to compel the Jews to become Christians. Justice, however, demands recognition of the fact that many popes protected the Jews. Gregory I. condemned all compulsory baptisms, and by kindliness and rewards tried to win the Jews for the Church. Although he put no high estimate upon converts gained in this way, he counted upon their descendants. "If we do not win the parents," he said, "we shall have their children"—a remark which experience proved to be ill-founded, especially in Spain. There was hardly a century that works were not written to bring about the conversion of the Jews, hardly one in which rewards were not offered to secure them for the Church, and also not a century in which numbers of proselytes, thoroughly convinced, did not pass over to Christianity, many of whom became an honor to the Church.

2. Missions in Spain. Proselytes have ever been especially active in missions to the Jews. In the seventh century Bishop Julian of Toledo (d. 690) wrote the *De sextæ ætatis comprobatione contra Judæos* to refute the Jewish notion, then asserting itself, that Jesus could not be the Messiah, as he was not to appear until the sixth millennium of the world. Almost at the same time Isidore of Seville wrote two books in which he proved the Christian doctrine of faith from the Old Testament and especially pointed out that the Christians now formed the true Israel. Raymond of Pennaforte, general of the Dominicans, introduced the study of the Hebrew language and Talmudic writings in his order, especially for the promotion of missionary activity among the Jews; and another Dominican, Pablo Christiani of Montpellier, a Jew by descent, was the first real missionary preacher. He traveled in southern France and elsewhere, preaching and disputing with the Jews in churches and synagogues, and proving the Messiahship and divinity of Jesus from Bible and Talmud. At the same time the Dominican Raymund Martin, a Christian by birth, but well versed in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic, wrote his *Pugio fidei contra Mauros et Judæos*, an armory for the disputes of the following times. Abner of Burgos, a respected physician and Christian convert, wrote several Hebrew and Spanish books for the conversion of the Jews. John of Valladolid, another proselyte, wrote an exposition on Ibn Ezra's commentary on the Ten Commandments and a *Concordia legum* of Judaism and Christianity. Cardinal Pedro de Luna, later Benedict XIII., himself had a debate in Pampeluna with Rabbi Shem Ṭob ben Shaprut, and took a lifelong interest in the conversion of the Jews. He was the first patron of Rabbi Solomon Halevi (1353–1435), later known as Paul of St. Maria, archbishop of Burgos, and interchanged controversial letters with Joshua of Lorca, until he finally became a Christian. Among the thousands who at that time entered the Church, frequently, it is true, for secular reasons, or from fear or compulsion, there was a great number of sincere believers in Christ. In the beginning of the fifteenth century the Dominican Vincent Ferrer (q.v.), who wandered through Italy, France, and Spain as a missioner, developed an astonishing activity in converting Jews; at least 20,500 are said to have been baptized in Castile and Aragon. The reason for such zeal of conversion in Spain was due to the extraordinary power of the Jewish population which threatened to suppress the spiritual and material development of Spain.

3. Missions in Other Countries.

In France there were comparatively few efforts in this direction; and at the court of Louis the Pious there was even a suspicious sympathy with Judaism. With the exception of Nicholas of Lyra (1300–40), of Jewish descent, though born a Christian, who wrote a number of controversial writings against the Jews, there was hardly any one who labored for the conversion of the Jews. Still, France lacked neither pious proselytes and families of proselytes nor numerous compulsory baptisms, persecutions, and acts of violence. In Italy both power and monks were deeply interested in the conversion of the Jews. Lorenzo of Brundisium (d. 1619), general of the Capuchins, preached with great power and traveled through Italy, Hebrew Bible in hand, converting rabbis and laymen. In Rome many Jews accepted Christianity at all periods, and in 1550 Paul III. founded an institute for the conversion of the Jews; while Pius V. won more than a hundred learned and rich Jews for the Church. Many of the innumerable proselytes in Italy occupied high positions in the Church, or were received into the nobility of the nation. The history of missions among the Jews in England is singular. During the reign of William Rufus, the Jews complained because so many of their number became Christians; the king attempted to force them to return to Judaism, but the steadfastness of these proselytes hindered the execution of his menaces (1100). About 1200 Richard, prior of Bermondsey, established a hospital of converts, and the Dominicans in Oxford opened a similar institution. Henry III. set apart a special house in London for the reception and care of proselytes, for which it soon became necessary to organize branch institutions. Under Edward I. 500 proselytes received baptism in the Converts' House, yet this same king was compelled, in 1290, to banish 16,500 Jews for usury and coining. Germany stands in the strongest contrast to England. Here there is no record of any missionary efforts, but only of compulsory baptisms occasioned by the persecutions during the crusades, the invasions of the Tatars, and the Black Death.

Modern Roman Catholic efforts for the conversion of the Jews began in France. The two brothers Lehmann, both proselytes, worked successfully under Pius IX. among the Jews of France. The proselyte Abbé Bauer used his brilliant oratorical gifts for the conversion of the Jews in Paris and Vienna. The most extensive work, however, was carried on in Palestine by the proselyte Maria Alphonse Ratisbonne, who joined the Roman Catholic Church in 1842. With his brother he established the order of Nôtre Dame de Sion for the education of Jewish girls and founded many charitable institutions, not only in Palestine, but also in France, England, Chalcedon, Galatia, and elsewhere.

1. Lutheran and Reformed Churches.

III. In Protestant Churches: Luther's attitude toward the Jews was at first favorable, as is evident from his *Dass Jesus ein geborner Jude war*, but in later works, as in his *Von den Juden und ihren Lügen*, he showed utter hopelessness of the conversion of the Jews, so that little zeal in that direction could have been expected. Nevertheless, there were numerous proselytes in the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, among them Immanuel Tremellius of Ferrara, who at Heidelberg, with Ursinus and Olevianus, took part in the compilation of the Heidelberg Catechism. In the seventeenth century Ezra Edzard (b. at Hamburg June 28, 1629; d. there Jan. 1, 1708) of Hamburg, was greatly interested in the conversion of the Jews, and from his own means established a considerable fund for that purpose. His sons Georg and Sebastian continued his work. Similar funds seem to have existed in other cities; as, for example, in Geneva, where a part of the ecclesiastical revenue is still called *Fond des proselytes*, and again in Darmstadt and Frankfort. Among the Pietists, who distinguished themselves by their missionary zeal, Spener declared it the duty of the government to take care of the conversion of the Jews; while the Moravian Samuel Lieberkühn labored thirty years among the Jews. In 1728, at the suggestion of A. H. Francke, Callenberg founded at Halle an Institutum Judaicum, which lasted until 1792. The two first missionaries of that institution were Widmann and Manitius, who from 1730 to 1735 traveled through Poland, Bohemia, Germany, Denmark, and England. In 1736 they were joined by Stephan Schulz, the most important worker of that institute, who extended his travels over the whole of Europe and the Orient. Through the instrumentality of Lessing, and still more through Moses Mendelssohn, a reform movement took place among the Jews, starting from Germany and penetrating the East, while in the Romance countries similar results were achieved by the French Revolution. The gradual renunciation of the Talmud on the part of the liberal Jews dates from that time. The immediate result was that large numbers turned to Christianity, especially in Berlin. In 1816–43, 3,984 Jews, and these the richest and most cultured, were baptized in the eight old Prussian provinces.

2. English Missions.

The corruption of the churches and their institutions, and the apostasy of thousands from all faith, led many in England to believe that the end of the world was near, and that soon a general conversion of the Jews was to take place. With Simeon of Cambridge, Marsh of Birmingham, the proselyte J. F. Fry, and the preacher Legh Richmond, Lewis Way, a wealthy clergyman, founded in 1808, under the patronage of the Duke of Kent, the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, which included both churchmen and dissenters until 1815, when the latter withdrew from the organization. Way traveled in Holland, Germany, and Russia to better the political and social position of the Jews and to awaken missionary zeal among the Christians. He induced Alexander I. to promise, in 1817, his special protection, as well as lands, to baptized Jews. In 1814 the Duke of Kent laid the corner-stone of a church for the Jews, to which was added an educational institution for children of proselytes, a Hebrew college for the training of missionaries, and a trade school for proselytes. Baptisms became so numerous that in 1832 the founding of a Hebrew-Christian Church in England was planned, but could not be realized. The society is the oldest, largest, richest, most enterprising, and best organized of its type, and has auxiliary societies throughout the British Isles and Canada. The society, whose income in 1900–01 was £46,338, with an expenditure of £36,910, employed at 52 missionary stations 199 workers, among them 25 clergymen, 19 physicians, 34 female missionaries, 20 lay missionaries, 35 colporteurs, 58 teachers, and 8 apothecaries. Of these, 82 were converts from Judaism. Of the 52 stations 18 are in England, 3 in Austria, 1 in France, 4 in Germany, 2 in Holland, 1 in Italy, 4 in Rumania, 1 in Russia, 1 in Constantinople; in Asia there are 10 stations, among them Jerusalem with 27 workers; in Africa there are 7 stations. About 5,000 Jews have been baptized by the society since its foundation. Its principal organs are the *Jewish Missionary Intelligence* and the *Jewish Missionary Advocate.*

3. Minor English Missionary Societies.

Among the other English missionary societies for the conversion of the Jews are the following: The Free Church of Scotland Jewish Mission, established in 1840, with about 77 workers and stations at Budapest, Constantinople, Breslau, Tiberias, Safed, and Edinburgh, and publishing the *Free Church of Scotland Monthly* and *The Children's Record;* the Presbyterian Church in Ireland Jewish Mission, established in 1841, with stations at Hamburg-Altona (with two ordained missionaries and three colporteurs and Evangelists) and Damascus (with four ordained missionaries and four other laborers), and publishing *The Missionary Herald of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland;* the British Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Jews, established in London in 1842, its membership including representatives of the various dissenting bodies, with twenty-two missionaries and sixteen stations in England, Germany, Austria, Russia, and Turkey, and publishing *The Jewish Herald;* the Church of Scotland Jewish Mission, established in 1841, with stations in Alexandria, Beirut, Smyrna, Constantinople, and Salonica, and publishing *The Church of Scotland Home and Foreign Mission Record;* The Presbyterian Church of England Jewish Mission, established in 1860, with two missionaries in London, one agent in Aleppo and one in Corfu; Parochial Missions to the Jews at Home and Abroad, established in 1875, under the auspices of the Established Church, laboring chiefly in parishes with a large percentage of Jewish population, having stations in England and Bombay, and publishing *Church and Synagogue;* the Mildmay Mission to the Jews, established in 1876, with stations in Russia, South Africa, Egypt, and Bulgaria, and publishing *Trusting and Toiling;* the East London Mission to Jews, established in 1877, with a mission house and orphans' home; the Barbican Mission to the Jews, established in 1879; The Jerusalem and the East Mission Fund, established in 1897 by Bishop Blyth of Jerusalem, with eighteen assistants in Jerusalem, Beirut, Haifa, Cairo, and Suez, and publishing *Bible Lands;* The Kilburn Mission to the Jews, established in 1896 by the proselyte Ben Oliel, especially for the well-to-do business men of London; and The London City Mission to Jews with sixteen laborers among the 250,000 foreign Jews in London. Besides these societies, a Hebrew Christian Union and a Prayer Union for Israel were founded in 1897, the latter publishing *The Friend of Israel.*

4. Missionary Societies in Other Countries.

In Germany there are three societies for missions among Jews. The Gesellschaft zur Verbreitung des Christentums unter den Juden was established in 1822 at Berlin under the influence of Lewis Way and Tholuck. It has stations in Berlin, Posen, Czernowicz, and Stanislau. Since its existence about 713 baptisms have taken place. Its official organ is the *Nathanael.* Independently of this missionary society Prof. H. L. Strack manages the Institutum Judaicum, an association formed for the purpose of acquainting theological students at the university with the mission among the Jews. The Evangelisch-lutherischer Centralverein für Mission unter Israel was established in 1871 at Leipsic. It tries to unite all Lutheran missions among the Jews to uniform activity and employs three laborers in Leipsic and in Galicia; its organ is the *Saat auf Hoffnung.* In connection with it Professor Delitzsch founded in 1880 the first Institutum Judaicum. There is also a seminary for missionaries among the Jews. The Westdeutscher Verein für Israel was established in 1843 in Cologne. It has stations at Cologne, Frankfort, and Strasburg. Its organ is the *Missionsblatt des westdeutschen Vereins für Israel.*

Switzerland has a Verein der Freunde Israels at Basel, established in 1830. It publishes *Der Freund Israels* and *L'Ami d'Israël.* France has a Société française pour l'évangélisation d'Israel, established in 1888 by the Rev. G. Krüger, with one missionary for France and agencies in Algiers and Oran. Its organ is *Le Réveil d'Israël.* Scandinavia has three societies for missions among the Jews: the "Evangelical National Society," established in 1856, with a station at Hamburg; the "Society for Missions among Israel," established in 1875 by the Rev. A. Lindström at Stockholm, with a home for proselytes at Stockholm and lay missionaries at Budapest and Cracow, and publishing *Missions Tidning för Israel;* the "Norwegian Central Committee for Missions to Israel," established in 1865 at Christiania, with two missionaries at Galaz and Braïla in Rumania, and publishing *Missions Blad for Israel.* In Russia, where half of all the Jews of the world live, the government limits Protestant missionary work among the Jews. Missionary work in the proper sense is restricted to the State Church.

In Kishinef Faltin developed a successful missionary activity after 1859, and Joseph Rabinowitz in 1882–99. In Melbourne, Australia, there is the Friends of Israel Association, of which the proselyte Abramowitz is the head.

5. Missions in the United States.

In the United States there are eleven church missions: the Church Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews (Protestant Episcopal) established in 1842 in New York, with stations at New York and Philadelphia and five missionaries, and publishing *The Gospel of the Circumcision;* the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church of North America, established in 1871 in New York, working at Urumia, Teheran, Hamadan, and Sidon, and publishing *The Assembly Herald;* the Reformed Presbyterian Mission to the Jews, established in 1894 in Philadelphia, with three laborers; and the Messiah Mission of Chicago, established in 1896 and continued since 1899 as the Mission of the Women's Association of the United Presbyterian Church of North America. Specifically Lutheran are the four following missions: the Norwegian Zionsforeningen for Israelsmissionen blandt norske Lutheranere i Amerika, established 1878 at Minneapolis, with three laborers in Minsk and Odessa in Russia and New York; the Jewish Mission of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, established in 1885 in New York; the Jewish Mission of the Joint Synod of Ohio, established in 1892; and the Mission of the German Lutheran Synod of the Jews in Chicago, established in 1894 in Chicago. The Methodists have the New York City Church Extension and Missionary Society, established in 1892; the Baptists, the Missionary Society of the Seventh Day Baptists, established in 1887; and the Quakers the Friends' Mission at Ramallah in Palestine, established in 1870 by English Quakers, and continued in 1887 by American Quakers as the Eli and Sibyl Jones Mission. Besides these, there are twenty-one independent missions, the most important of which are: the New York City Mission, the oldest of all American missions, established in 1828; the Chicago Hebrew Mission, founded in 1887 and publishing *The Jewish Era;* the Gospel Mission of the Jews, formerly the Hope of Israel Mission, established in 1892 in New York; the Brooklyn Christian Mission to the Jews, established 1892 in New York and publishing *Our Hope* and the Yiddish "Hope of Israel"; the World's Gospel Union, established in 1892 at Kansas City, Mo., with eight missionaries, one in Morocco; the American Mission to the Jews, established in 1895 by the proselyte Warschaviak; and the Immanuel Mission to the Jews in Cleveland, established in 1898, and publishing *Immanuel's Witness.* The American missions to the Jews engage 150 laborers in all.

IV. Methods and Practical Considerations: A distinction must be drawn between missions among those Jews who live scattered in a Christian country, and those who live in a compact mass and have their own language and customs, and those in Mohammedan and heathen countries. Missions to the Jews living within the pale of Christian churches can have no other purpose but to incorporate them in the churches. This is especially the case with the Jews of western Europe.

1. Methods in Christian Lands.

For more than a century they have been in a process of assimilation with Christian nations. Self-preservation, if no other motive, must compel the Christian Church to carry on missionary work among the Jews; for it would be extremely dangerous if so many thousands of Jews in the midst of Christians were equal or even superior to them in political, social, moral, and economical respects, and yet opposed in religion. It is the duty of the Church to educate suitable catechetes and evangelists for this work among the Jews. All missionary activity should start from the Church. Among the Evangelical churches only the English and Scotch and some smaller free churches promote these missions as a branch of their churchly activity. It is not the duty of the Church, however, to provide for the material assistance of proselytes; this belongs rather to private charity and independent associations. The proper persons to be employed in converting the Jews are Christian clergymen; although it is much more difficult to prepare born Christians for work of that kind than born Jews, who can more easily adapt themselves to the mode of thinking of their brethren. But it would be entirely wrong to gather the Jews into a separate Judæo-Christian Church, since that would lead only to a new sect; and, on the other hand, extreme caution must be observed that baptism may not be granted too hastily or to unworthy recipients. Methods of missionary work differ according to the various conditions of the Jews. While the Jews lived almost without any legal rights among the Christians, the State and the Church could force them to hear the preaching of the Gospel in their own synagogues or in churches. Since the emancipation of the Jews, this method has become impossible, and they have accordingly been visited in their homes, and the Gospel has been announced to them by the distribution of tracts and books. But as such visits may be considered by the Jews an invasion of their homes, nothing is left but occasional meetings in public places. Public lectures, reading-rooms, and free schools have also contributed to the success of missions. The instruction of catechumens must be adapted to their religious condition and spiritual training. Special consideration must be devoted to those difficult doctrines which for the Jew are not only offensive, but even detestable, such as the doctrines of the Trinity, of the divinity of Christ, and of the atonement.

2. Methods in Non-Evangelical Countries.

Missionary activity must assume a different attitude in non-Evangelical countries, where Jews live in a compact mass. This is the case principally in eastern Europe, especially in the western provinces of Russia that formerly belonged to Poland. The number of Russian Jews is estimated at from 4,500,000 to 6,000,000. Thousands of Jews are also crowded together in Galicia and Rumania. In countries like Russia missionaries encounter special difficulties, owing to deep-rooted Jewish fanaticism, hatred of the Christians, Jewish narrowness, and great erudition in the Talmud and Cabala. A missionary who is not thoroughly versed in Hebrew literature and science will here be little respected. As only converted Jews thoroughly know the Jewish heart and the Jewish head, they have, almost without exception, been used for this kind of missionary work. But there is always danger that inefficient missionaries may be employed merely because they are proselytes, and that born Jews may be too indulgent to Jewish peculiarities and prejudice. Such deficiencies and dangers will best be avoided by the combined work of born Christians and proselytes. Missionary activity among foreign Jews has offered almost insuperable difficulties. If an individual person or family in the midst of large Jewish congregations adopts Christianity, reception into a Christian congregation already in existence is often impossible. The conversion of whole families has been almost impossible, but since a peculiar interest in Evangelical Christianity has arisen in Poland and Russia, and dozens of Jews desire instruction from clergymen and missionaries, it will perhaps be possible to gather eventual converts into Judæo-Christian congregations; for the Jews of the East are neither suited nor willing to be absorbed into another nationality and church. Literature is a very important means of influencing Jews, especially as the Hebrew New Testament is well received and much read by the Jews of the East, particularly in the excellent translation of Delitzsch. Jews in heathen or Mohammedan countries form the smallest part of the population and they are on the lowest level in spiritual and moral respects. Though not learned in the Talmud, they cling obstinately to their old traditions, and Christianity has taken little root among them.

3. Influence of Zionism on Jewish Missions.

Since 1897 the movement of Zionism has presented new problems to Christian missions. It arose as a reaction against the efforts of assimilation, and as a means of remedying the oppressions of anti-Semitism; and its object is to regain the Jewish country for the Jewish people. It looks upon missions as an instrument by which an increasing number are cut off from the national body of the Jews; but on the other hand, the Zionists seek the friendship of the Christians because they need their moral and material aid in the realization of their plans. Thus Zionists are enemies of missions, but not enemies of Christianity. Missionaries must, therefore, convince the Jews that acceptance of Christianity does not necessarily include the sacrifice of Jewish nationality, and that a national regeneration of their people is impossible without a religious regeneration.

The total number of missionaries working among the 10,000,000 or more Jews in the world is about 500. (F. Heman.)

Bibliography: F. F. A. de la Roi, *Die evangelische Christenheit und die Juden unter dem Geschichtspunkt der Mission*, 3 vols., Carlsruhe, 1884–92; A. A. Bonar, *Narrative of a Mission of Enquiry to the Jews from the Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1854; J. Mason, *Three Years in Turkey; Medical Mission to the Jews*, London, 1860; Mrs. Edwards, *Missionary Work among the Jews in Moldavia, Galicia, and Silesia*, ib. 1867; C. K. Kalkar, *Israel und die Kirche*, Hamburg, 1869; G. A. Dalman, *Kurzgefasstes Handbuch der Mission unter Israel*, Berlin, 1893; J. Dunlop, *Memories of Gospel Triumphs among the Jews*, London, 1894; *The Jewish Question and the Mission to the Jews*, ib. 1894; A. L. Williams; *Missions to the Jews*, ib. 1897; W. T. Gidney, *The Jews and their Evangelization*, ib. 1899; idem, *Missions to Jews*, ib. 1899; *At Home and Abroad*, ib. 1900; A. E. Thompson, *A Century of Jewish Missions*, Edinburgh, 1902; J. Richter, *Jüdische Missionsgeschichte*, Gütersloh, 1906; H. O. Dwight, *Blue Book of Missions for 1907*, New York, 1907; J. Schneider, *Kirchliches Jahrbuch*, Gütersloh, 1909.

JEZEBEL: Wife of Ahab, seventh king of Israel. She was a daughter of Ethbaal, king of Tyre, and one of the most unscrupulous yet energetic queens of history. She seems to have swayed the mind of her husband, and where he was weak and vacillating, she supplied courage and resolution. She established the worship of the Phenician Baal in the kingdom, and, while supporting at her own table the priests of Baal, persecuted the prophets of Israel (I Kings xviii. 4), and vowed vengeance upon Elijah (I Kings xix. 2). When her husband despaired of getting Naboth's vineyard, she ordered the judicial murder of Naboth and secured for her husband the coveted possession (I Kings xxi. 5). She survived Ahab fourteen years, but continued to have great influence at court, and saw her daughter Athaliah married to the king of Judah (II Kings viii. 26). When Jehu drove into Jezreel, with the design of extirpating the house of Ahab, Jezebel was thrown from the upper story of the palace to death on the stones beneath. Her body was crushed under Jehu's chariot-wheels, and, according to II Kings ix. 30–35, devoured by dogs. See Ahab; and Elijah.

Bibliography: Consult, besides the pertinent sections in the works named under Ahab: *DB*, ii. 656–657; *EB*, ii. 2457; *JE*, vii. 186.

JEZREEL: A plain mentioned Josh. xvii. 16; Judges vi. 33; Hos. i. 5, etc. The name ("God sows") denotes the fruitfulness of the plain as something unusual, extraordinary, and wrought by God, and indicates that from the most ancient times agriculture was adequately recompensed in the region. Jezreel is the largest plain in the mountain land of Israel, and is therefore called the "valley" (Judges v. 15; I Sam. xxxi. 7), and "the great plain" (I Macc. xii. 49). It was of great significance in commerce, and the road from Egypt led by three branches to the southern edge of the plain and continued northwest to the coast, northeast to Tabor and Damascus, while the eastern edge was crossed by the road from Samaria to Galilee. This made it a continual cause of strife. The Israelites first gained possession of it by the victory of Barak and Deborah (Judges v.), though the Canaanites retained possession of Megiddo, Ibleam, Taanach, and Dor until the time of the kings (Judges i. 27). To Manasseh belonged the southern portion (Josh. xvii. 11–13), to Issachar the eastern part (Josh. xix. 18–20), while Zebulun was on the north (Josh. xix. 10 sqq.). The Israelites under Saul and Jonathan sustained a defeat beneath Gilboa (I Sam. xxxi.); Ahab defeated Ben-hadad II. near Aphek (I. Kings xx 26); and Josiah was defeated by Necho II. at Megiddo (II Kings xxiii. 29). The city of Jezreel, belonging to Issachar, was situated on the plain, at the foot of Gilboa (Josh. xix. 18), above Beth-shean (I Kings iv. 12), not far from Carmel

(I Kings xviii. 45), and was the home of Ahab and Naboth (I Kings xxi. 1) and the scene of Jehu's exploit (II Kings ix. 17 sqq.). It is called Esdraelon in Judith, iii. 9, iv. 6, and in later times, as in the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius; the modern village Zer'in has preserved the name. There were other places of note on the plain. Josephus (*Ant.* XX., vi. 1) mentions Ginaea, the modern Jenin, the old Engannim of Josh. xix. 21. Taanach of Judges v. 19 is the modern Ta'annuk. The city of Megiddo lay on the south border of the plain, and appears as the Egyptian Maketi and as Magidda in the Amarna Tablets; it was a royal Canaanitic city, and was refortified by Solomon. In the western part lay the village of Nein, to be identified with the Nain of Luke vii. 11 sqq. The modern Endur bespeaks the ancient En-dor of Josh. xvii. 11, south of which is Sulem, the Shunem of Josh. xix. 18. Aphek must be sought not far from the city of Jezreel, possibly in the ruins of the modern El-Fule.

(H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, chap. xix., London, 1897; H. Reland, *Palästina*, pp. 359–370, Utrecht, 1714; C. Ritter, *Comparative Geography of Palestine*, ii. 314–315, 317, 322, iv. 333, 343–350, Edinburgh, 1866; G. Ebers and H. Guthe, *Palästina in Bild und Wort*, i. 275–290, Stuttgart, 1883; W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, ii. 177–191, New York, 1886; W. M. Müller, *Asien und Europa*, pp. 157–158, 167, Leipsic, 1893; F. Buhl, *Geographie des alten Palästina*, pp. 106 sqq., 204 sqq., Tübingen, 1896; Robinson, *Researches*, iii. 161–168; Schürer, *Geschichte*, i. 494–495, Eng. transl., I., ii. 89; *DB*, ii. 657–658; *EB*, ii. 2458–2460, *JE*, vii. 186–187.

JOAB: One of the most notable contemporaries of David, son of Zeruiah, sister of David, and brother of Abishai and Asahel (II Sam. ii. 18). He first appears in II Sam. ii. 13 as one of David's captains in the war with Ish-bosheth, though I Sam. xxii. 1 implies that he had then been long a companion of David. In this war Abner, the leader of Ish-bosheth's forces, slew Asahel, Joab's brother, causing a blood feud with Joab, who avenged his brother by killing Abner, but under such circumstances as to involve David in the suspicion of playing Abner false, since he was treating with Abner for the union of the northern tribes under his sway (II Sam. ii.–iii.). Joab was so powerful in the army that David had to confess his inability to punish Joab for the murder and the consequences which might have resulted (II Sam. iii. 39). I Chron. xi. 4–8 makes Joab win his position of leader by capturing the fortress of Jerusalem; but this does not agree with II Sam. v. 6–9 and the context, according to which Joab was already a leader.

According to II. Sam viii. 16, when David became king of all Israel, to Joab was given command of the army, but since military achievements thereafter were ascribed to David himself, the name of Joab appears only occasionally. He waged a bloody war in Edom and drove the Edomitic king in exile to Egypt (I Kings xi. 15–17); defeated the Aramean allies of the Ammonites (II Sam. x. 6–14); executed the command of David to have Uriah killed in a skirmish (II Sam. xi. 14–27); and yielded to David the glory of a hard-earned victory over the capital of the Ammonites (II Sam. xii. 26–31). It was Joab who, by employing a stratagem carried through by a wise woman of Tekoa, persuaded David to recall from exile Absalom, who had killed his brother Amnon, and two years later secured a formal reconciliation between father and son (II Sam. xiii. 39–xiv. 33). In the rebellion of Absalom Joab remained true to David, killed the unfilial rebel, and advised the king wisely when the latter in mourning for his son was likely to alienate the affections of his people. He defeated an attempt of David to appoint Amasa in his place (II Sam. xvii.–xx.), killing Amasa in the war which arose over the rebellion of Sheba and thus raising another blood-feud. He opposed the census of the people ordered by David (II Sam. xiv. 1–9). At the end of David's reign Joab favored Adonijah as the rightful heir to the throne, and thereby incurred the enmity of Solomon, who was designated David's successor and was favored by the party of Nathan. For this and earlier offenses Joab was slain at the altar by command of Solomon (I Kings ii. 18–34).

(H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The commentaries on Samuel and Kings and the relevant sections in the works on the history of Israel (named under AHAB); *DB*, ii. 658–659; *EB*, ii. 2460–2462; *JE*, vii. 187–189.

JOACHIM I., jō′ɑ-kim: Margrave of Brandenburg; b. Feb. 21, 1484; d. at Stendal (40 m. n.n.e. of Magdeburg), July 11, 1535. Although only fifteen years of age at the death of his father he assumed control of the government and appeared in the diet of 1500 with the dignity of electoral prince, having associated his ten-year-old brother with himself as nominal co-ruler. Through Dietrich of Bülow the young prince had received a thorough humanistic education, and in his intense admiration for the new learning he sought and secured the friendship of the famous Tritheim, abbot of Sponheim, who, after a long solicitation, visited Berlin in 1505 and took part in the following year in the foundation of the University at Frankfort-on-the-Oder. Both by Tritheim and by Aleander Joachim was praised as a learned prince and as a patron of the sciences. In the government of his territories he displayed exceptional energy in the suppression of public disorder and he followed this up with the introduction of the Roman law and important judicial reforms which, however, were slow in coming into effect. In the imperial election which resulted in the choice of Charles V., Joachim played an unworthy rôle of mingled duplicity and weakness, carrying on secret negotiations both with Emperor Maximilian and with Francis I. of France and appearing finally as a candidate himself. He failed, however, to secure the vote even of his brother Albert, whom his influence had made, in 1514, archbishop of Mainz (see ALBERT OF BRANDENBURG). He held himself aloof from the imperial court until the victory of Pavia in 1525 made Charles all-powerful in Germany. Thereupon Joachim became a thorough partizan of the House of Hapsburg.

As early as 1514 he had allowed the sale of indulgences to be carried on in his dominions, and three years later Tetzel was permitted to pursue his practises there. The theologians at the University of Frankfort took sides against Luther, whom the margrave regarded with personal dislike because of the former's bitter attack on Archbishop Albert. A personal interview with Luther previous to the meeting of the Diet of Worms served only to intensify the opposition between the two. In the execution of the provisions of the Edict of Worms Joachim took the leading part, gaining thereby increased favors from the emperor. In 1524 he married his eldest son to a daughter of Luther's enemy, George of Saxony, and in the following year joined the association formed at Dessau for the destruction of "The Abominable Sect of Lutherans." In spite of all his efforts, however, the new teachings made rapid progress in Brandenburg and created dissensions in his own household. In 1527 his wife Elizabeth received the communion secretly from a Lutheran priest, largely through the influence of her brother Christian II. of Denmark, whose interference in his domestic affairs aroused bitter resentment in Joachim. The electress escaped lifelong imprisonment only by flight, and Luther's intervention served but to intensify the elector's hatred. At the Diet of Augsburg he appeared as one of the leading champions of a policy of relentless warfare against the Lutherans. In 1533 he concluded with George of Saxony and Archbishop Albert a league at Halle in opposition to the Schmalkald League. In his will, drawn up in 1534, he laid the injunction upon his successors to remain faithful to the Roman communion, and, when his son Joachim's wife died, he obtained for him the hand of Hedwig, daughter of Sigismund, king of Catholic Poland. His death revealed, however, that his efforts against the spread of the reformed faith were practically vain.

(G. Kawerau.)

Bibliography: J. G. Droysen, *Geschichte der preussischen Politik*, ii. 2, pp. 1–163, Leipsic, 1870; A. Müller, *Geschichte der Reformation in der Mark Brandenburg*, Berlin, 1839; C. W. Spieker, *Geschichte der Einführung der Reformation in . . . Brandenburg*, ib. 1839; D. Erdmann, *Luther und die Hohenzollern*, pp. 37 sqq., Breslau, 1883; J. Heidemann, *Die Reformation in der Mark Brandenburg*, Berlin, 1889. For matter upon the choice of the emperor consult: *Reichstagsakten*, new series, vol. i., Gotha, 1893; E. R. Roesler, *Die Kaiserwahl Carls V.*, Vienna, 1878. Consult also the literature given under Trithemius.

JOACHIM II.: Margrave of Brandenburg; b. Jan. 9, 1505; d. at Köpenik (8 m. s.e. of Berlin), Jan. 3, 1571. He was the son of Joachim I. (q.v.), was educated under the supervision of his uncle the Elector Albert (see Albert of Brandenburg), and at an early age conceived an interest in theological questions. By his marriage with the daughter of George of Saxony in 1524 and of Sigismund of Poland in 1535, his father had sought to bind him to the Roman faith. But it was early apparent that he would not follow closely in the footsteps of his father, whom he succeeded in 1535. At first he attempted to play the part of mediator between the two parties and eagerly embraced the plan of a general council for the settlement of the religious schism, but when the convocation of such an assembly was repeatedly postponed he turned his efforts solely in the direction of establishing harmony within the empire. In 1538 he submitted to the emperor a compromise program for the attainment of such an end, which led to prolonged negotiations in that and the following year without resulting in any definite achievement. The death of George of Saxony in 1539 removed one of the strongest influences for Catholicism in Brandenburg. For some years before this event Joachim had permitted the open extension of the Lutheran influence, and in 1538 he submitted to Melanchthon a program of church reform drawn up for him by the dean of Elgersma. Melanchthon rejected the constitutions as insufficiently Evangelical, and the widespread movement among the nobles and the third estate convinced the margrave that the time for a radical change had come. New church constitutions were drawn up, after preparation by Prince Georg von Anhalt, by a commission comprising Jacob Stratner, Georg Buchholzer, and Georg Witzel and were approved by Melanchthon. In November, 1539, the margrave formally received the Lord's Supper according to the Lutheran form and subsequently the revised church constitutions were sent to Wittenberg, where they received the approval of Luther, Melanchthon, and Jonas, though of all Protestant Church systems they represented the least departure from the Roman Catholic position. Joachim succeeded in obtaining the confirmation of the emperor on the promise of submission to the decisions of a future council. The new ordinances were speedily introduced and the gradual abolition of the monastic system was begun.

In the field of politics also Joachim attempted to play the rôle of arbitrator between the two parties. At the Colloquy of Worms (q.v.) in 1540–41 his representatives sat with the "submissive" as opposed to the "protesting" deputies, and he based much hope upon the plan here secretly formulated for another conference at Regensburg where it was hoped that the reunion of the parties might be achieved. Luther, to whom the project was submitted, rejected its terms as unsatisfactory both to the Roman Church and to the Protestants, but Joachim did not abandon his activity, and when the emperor contemplated the despatch of a special mission to Luther he offered himself for the service. Before the outbreak of the Schmalkald War (1546) he attempted to mediate between the leaders of the League and the emperor, but, failing, sent a force of cavalry in the following year to the aid of Maurice of Saxony in return for the elevation of his second son Frederick to the post of coadjutor bishop of Magdeburg and Halberstadt. He pledged himself to abide by the decisions of the council to be assembled at Trent and obtained the same concessions in the religious sphere that had been granted to Maurice of Saxony. He was active in advocating the adoption of the Augsburg Interim (see Agricola, Johann; Interim, 2). From this time his political importance declines; his subsequent efforts were directed toward dynastic aggrandizement, and with this ambition he permitted his son Sigismund to accept the archbishopric of Magdeburg and the see of Halberstadt on the condition of complete submission to the pope. It was only political interests, however, that prevented the complete introduction of the Protestant confession in his dominions, an event which followed the death of Joachim and the succession of his son John George.

(G. Kawerau.)

Bibliography: Besides the literature given under Joachim I., consult: A. Hartung, *Joachim II. und sein Sohn Johann Georg*, Berlin, 1798; F. Meine, *Die vermittelnde Stellung Joachims II. . . . zu den politischen und religiösen Parteien seiner Zeit*, Lüneburg, 1898; articles in the *Forschungen zur brandenburgischen und preussischen Geschichte*, ii (1889), 395 sqq., and vii (1894), 181 sqq., by F. Holtze, and vi (1893), 529 sqq., by H. Landwehr; and new articles of importance by N. Müller in *Jahrbuch für brandenburgische Geschichte*, 1904 sqq.

JOACHIM OF FIORE (Lat. *Floris*) and the **"EVERLASTING GOSPEL"** (*Evangelium aeternum*): Joachim, abbot of San Giovanni in Fiore (in the Sila Mountains, 25 m. e. of Cosenza), Calabria, is said to have been born of wealthy parents at Celico, a village near Cosenza, in 1145(?), to have made a pilgrimage to Palestine, and then to have become a monk. In 1177 he was abbot of a Cistercian monastery at Corazzo (12 m. s.e. of Cosenza), but often withdrew to the mother monastery of Casamari (near Veroli, 50 m. s.e. of Rome) to pursue his studies. Later (not before 1188) he gave up his place at Corazzo and founded San Giovanni in Fiore, which became the center of a congregation comprising more than thirty monasteries. Leading a strictly ascetic life and being reputed a prophet, he was highly respected by potentates and popes, who encouraged him in his Biblico-apocalyptic studies. He was very loyal to the papacy, and required the members of his order not to publish the writings which he left before they had passed the examination of the papal censor. Of his works only the three which he considered the most important have been printed, viz.: (1) *Liber concordiae novi ac veteris testamenti* (Venice, 1519); (2) *Psalterium decem chordarum* (Venice, 1527); (3) *Expositio apocalypsis* (also called *Apocalypsis nova*, Venice, 1527). There are other works still in manuscript. The commentaries on Isaiah and Jeremiah, attributed to him as early as the middle of the thirteenth century, are not his and differ from his genuine writings especially by their harsh attitude toward the Church of Rome. Now that they have been eliminated (by Engelhardt and Friederich), a correct estimate of Joachim is first made possible.

Joachim's Life and Writings.

His Relations and Significance.

He belongs in part to those of the twelfth century who, like Bernard of Clairvaux and Gerhoh of Reichersberg, in spite of their ecclesiastical sentiment and attitude, had nevertheless a keen eye for the shortcomings of ecclesiastical life. To this, like the visionaries Hildegard of Bingen and Elizabeth of Schönau, he added an excited expectation of an impending transformation of all things. The ancient hope of a glorious time of the Church on earth, preceded by fearful struggles, was revived anew. This hope Joachim based not on new revelations, but mainly upon the Holy Scriptures, for whose deeper understanding he imagined himself especially equipped through divine illumination. This illumination, however, did not take the place of study, but rather led him to a very thorough and, in his way, closer examination of the Scriptures, requiring much time and pains, and united to an artificial system of historico-prophetical theology. One may say that in this respect—following certain predecessors like Rupert of Deutz—he opens up a new development in the department of prophetical theology—a treatment which was afterward continued by Cocceius and Bengel, but it must not be forgotten that Joachim differs from both successors at least as much as each differs from the other.

His Exposition of History.

Upon the principles indicated above the following notion of history is established. It is divided into three dispensations (*status*) of the Father, of the Son, and of the Spirit; or, with reference to the three chief classes in the Church, the times of the predominance of the married, of the clerics, and of the monks. The first commenced with Adam, the second with John the Baptist; the preparation for the third began with St. Benedict, its development commenced with the order of the Cistercians, and about 1260 the final development will take place. The helping power, the *Parvuli de ecclesia latina*, will come from the Church of the West, which he thinks of as a monastic order, the *ordo justorum*. The elect in the Greek Church will also be united with the Roman Church, and the conversion of Gentiles and Jews will take place. This is the time in which, as is written in the Scriptures, Spirit and Life shall be in the Church, the time of the eternal Gospel (cf. *ALKG*, i. 52 sqq. and iii.). But there must still take place a last fight against the power of evil, which appears in the person of the last and worst antichrist, in Gog. After this will follow the final judgment and the great Sabbath of the consummation will be ushered in.

His Influence and Followers. The "Everlasting Gospel."

These thoughts, as further expanded in Joachim's writings, were favorably received. The thirteenth century was filled with more extravagant expectations of the future than the twelfth even, and the zealous Franciscans, who thought more of the ideal of poverty than of the official Church, were not the last to foster them. Here the ideas of Joachim found the most ready reception, and received an interpretation and expansion which were contrary to his own meaning. Here belong also the commentaries on Isaiah and Jeremiah. The Minorite Gerhard of Borgo San Donnino went the furthest. He regarded the three principal works of Joachim as truly inspired and canonical writings, as the last and highest part of the canon, which as *Evangelium aeternum* surpassed the Old and New Testaments. He prepared an edition of the same, supplied it with glosses and an *Introductorius in evangelium aeternum*. This work, published at Paris in 1254, caused a great stir (cf. the passage from the *Roman de la rose* in Haupt, 379, note 1). The theologians of the University of Paris, who saw themselves threatened in their ecclesiastical and scientific position by the mendicant monks, took up the gauntlet and made a complaint at Rome. In 1255 Alexander IV. appointed a commission to examine the matter (cf. the protocols in *AKLG*, i. 99–142). On Nov. 4, 1255, a bull was issued which condemned the *Introductorius*, without censuring, however, the writings of Joachim. When a synod at Arles (1260 or 1263) afterward condemned the writings of Joachim, this decision obtained no general ecclesiastical authority. His name remained as that of one beatified (*beatus*) in the memory of the Church, and as such he has a place in the *Acta Sanctorum*. Still less could this condemnation prevent Joachim's prophetical expositions from being read over and over again, and finding believers, though the year 1260 passed without change in the ecclesiastical relations. Johannes Petrus Olivi and Ubertinus of Casale, in general the *Spirituales* of the Minorites, are under their spell. There were Joachimites who adhered to the pope as well as Ghibelline Joachimites, and through the entire medieval period traces of Joachimism are found. S. M. Deutsch.

Bibliography: Besides the writings of Joachim and scattered notices, the first source is: *Synopsis virtutum beati Joachimi*, by Luca Consentinas, in F. Ughelli, *Italia sacra*, ix. 205 sqq., Venice, 1722 (also, with the *Vita* by Jacobus Graecus Syllanaeus and prefatory remarks, in *ASB*, May, vii. 83–112). Consult: J. G. V. Engelhardt, *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen*, pp. 1–150, 260–291, Erlangen, 1832 (fundamental); C. U. Hahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer im Mittelalter*, iii. 72–175, 259–346, Stuttgart, 1850 (in Engelhardt and Hahn's comprehensive extracts from Joachim's works); Friederich, in *ZWT*, ii (1859), 349–363, 444–514 (on Joachim's commentaries on Isaiah and Jeremiah); J. J. I. von Döllinger, in *Historisches Taschenbuch*, v., i (1871), 257–370; W. Preger, *Geschichte der deutschen Mystik*, i. 196–207, Leipsic, 1874 (defective); H. F. Reuter, *Geschichte der religiösen Aufklärung im Mittelalter*, ii. 191–218, 364–368, 536 sqq., Berlin, 1877; S. Denifle, *Das Evangelium aeternum und die Commission zu Anagni*, in *ALKG*, i (1885), 49–141; H. Haupt, *Zur Geschichte des Joachimismus*, in *ZKG*, vii (1884), 372 sqq. (agrees with Denifle on independent grounds); W. Bousset, *Der Antichrist in der Ueberlieferung*, Göttingen, 1895; E. Wadstein, *Die eschatologische Ideengruppe, Antichrist, Weltsabbat und Weltgericht*, Leipsic, 1896; Neander, *Christian Church*, iv. 220–232 et passim; Moeller, *Christian Church*, ii. 416–417.

JOAN, POPE: An alleged female pope, the central figure of a legend dating from the middle of the thirteenth century. The story occurs for the first time in the chronicle of Jean de Mailly, whence it was borrowed by his brother Dominican Stephen of Bourbon (d. 1261), both dating Pope Joan about 1100. The legend was chiefly disseminated, however, by the chronicle of Martinus Polonus (d. 1278). According to him, she was born either in Mainz or England, disguised as a man studied in Athens, aroused deep admiration at Rome by her learning, and was finally elected pope in 855, ruling two and a half years under the name of Johannes Angelicus. She died in childbirth in the street during a public procession and was buried where she expired. In the fifteenth century the legend of Pope Joan was regarded as a fact and was one of the main arguments in the controversies on the justification and extent of the papal power, additional credibility being given the story through its circulation by Roman Catholic historians. The legend is now regarded as based on a local Roman tradition concerning an ancient statue which has disappeared, but which seems to have represented a priest of Mithra and a child. This figure of the priest was popularly supposed to be a woman, and the unintelligible inscription on the group was taken to be the epitaph of the female pope. The name Joan (Johanna, Johannes) is obviously due to the numerous popes John, some of whom bore an indifferent reputation. The double date of 855 and 1100 originated in an attempt to fill a supposed lacuna in the list of popes at those times. (R. Schmid.)

Bibliography: The one book of importance is J. J. I. von Döllinger, *Papstfabeln des Mittelalters*, ed. Friedrich, Munich, 1890, Eng. transl. of 1st ed., pp. 3–74, New York, 1872. Consult also: E. Rhoides, *La Papesse Jeanne*, Paris, 1878, Eng. transl., London, 1887, Germ. transl., Leipsic, 1904; Neander, *Christian Church*, iii. 367, v. 285, 307; Moeller, *Christian Church*, ii. 159.

JOASH (JEHOASH; the two forms are used interchangeably in the sources): **1.** Seventh king of Judah, son and successor of Ahaziah after the six years' usurpation of his mother Athaliah. His dates according to the old chronology are 878–838 B.C.; according to Kamphausen, 836–797 B.C.; according to Duncker, 837–797 B.C.; and according to Curtis (*DB*, i. 401), 836–796 B.C. He was hidden by his aunt Jehoshebah when Athaliah massacred the seed royal, and in his seventh year was brought out from his concealment and made king under the practical regency of the priest Jehoiada (q.v.). The important external event of his reign was a threatened or real attack on Jerusalem by the Arameans under Hazael, which, according to II Kings xii. 18, was averted by a heavy tribute which stripped the city of its treasures, but according to the Chronicler (II Chron. xxiv. 23–24) was consummated and proved disastrous to the kingdom. Joash's religious significance lies in his services to the temple, which, under the usurpation of Athaliah, had been allowed to fall into disrepair. This was first committed to the charge of the priests and Levites, but was neglected by them. The matter was then taken out of their hands and entrusted to the chief priest and a civil officer. The sources seem to imply a defection from religious zeal after the death of Jehoiada; both sources, Kings and Chronicles, record his death by assassination at the hand of "his servants," and the Chronicler asserts that he was not buried "in the sepulchers of the kings."

2. Twelfth king of Israel, son and successor of Jehoahaz. His dates, according to the old chronology, are 840–823 B.C.; according to Kamphausen, 797–782 B.C.; according to Duncker, 798–790 B.C.; according to Curtis, 798–782 B.C. He gained a series of victories over Ben-hadad of Damascus by which he recovered large parts of the kingdom which had been lost to Hazael under Jehoahaz—an event made possible by the fact that under Shamshi-Ramman Assyria had renewed its battering at the gates of Damascus (see Assyria, VI., 3, § 9), and the Syrians were therefore fully employed guarding their eastern frontier. A second important matter was the defeat of Amaziah of Judah after the latter had wantonly provoked a conflict, and his punishment by a partial destruction of the wall of Jerusalem and reduction to vassalage. Some light is cast upon the religious status of Joash by II Kings xiii. 14 sqq., telling of a real attachment between himself and the prophet which suggests that the sentence of condemnation uttered in II Kings xiii. 11 implies a Judaic standpoint from which all the kings of Israel were regarded as recreant.

Bibliography: For 1 the sources are II Kings xi.–xii.; II Chron. xxii. 11–xxiv.; and for 2, II Kings xiii. 10–25, xiv. 8–16. Besides the literature given under Ahab, consult: C. F. Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of . . . Kings*, Oxford, 1903; *DB*, ii. 556–557; *EB*, ii. 2463.

JOB, BOOK OF.

I. Place of the Book in the Canon.
II. The Text.
  The Septuagint Text Shorter than the Hebrew (§ 1).
  Possible Explanations of Difference of Text (§ 2).
  Parallelism as an Aid to Text-Criticism (§ 3).
  Corruptions of Consonantal Text Explained (§ 4).
  Early Condition of the Text (§ 5).
III. Plan, Contents and Purpose.
  The Elihu Section a Later Addition (§ 1).
  The Plan (§ 2).
  The Religion of Job and His Friends (§ 3).
  Genuineness of the Prologue (§ 4).
  Satan in the Prologue and in Other Scripture (§ 5).
  The Purpose (§ 6).
  Organic Interconnection of Dialogue and Narrative (§ 7).
  Result of the Divine Admonitions (§ 8).
  Job's Attempt to Comprehend His Misfortunes (§ 9).
  Job's Ultimate Position (§ 10).
IV. The Author and the Time of Composition.

I. Place of the Book in the Canon: Among the Kethubhim, constituting the third division of the Hebrew canon (see CANON OF SCRIPTURE), three books stand together as a class marked by a system of accentuation different from that of the other books of Scripture. These are Psalms, Proverbs, and Job. The position of Job in the sources, however, varies greatly. The Talmud (Baba batra 14b) places it between Psalms and Proverbs; Jerome's *Prologus galeatus* puts it before Psalms; Origen seems to say (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, vi. 25) that while Psalms and the three Solomonic writings separate the historical and prophetical books, Job stood after the prophetical books and before Esther. Melito places Job after Psalms and the Solomonic books and before the prophetic writings. Indeed no uniformity appears and a very varying order of arrangement is attested; it is sufficient to say that the order in the English Bible—Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles—is attested by a large group of patristic writings. There is, on the other hand, a group of authorities which arrange the history of pious Job with those of other pious persons, Tobit, Judith, Esther, and Ezra, placing these among the historical books. A noteworthy position, due to the supposition that Job is a work of Moses, locates it with Joshua immediately following the Law. The idea underlying these various arrangements is either the poetic form, the relationship of contents, or the supposed authorship or the connection of its hero with early celebrities.

1. The Septuagint Text Shorter than the Hebrew.

II. The Text: The best helps to the text are the direct translations, including that of the Targum (which often gives a double rendering), the Peshito, the translations of Jerome and the Greek of Origen. The Hebrew basis of these versions witnesses to the same recension of the Hebrew as underlies the Masoretic text. From this the Septuagint varies in an astonishing manner, not only in its additions (like that of the speech of Job's wife in chap. ii., explicable on psychological grounds) but in its omissions; and with the Septuagint goes the Old Latin derived from it. With this corresponds also the Old Latin which Jerome sought to supplement by his Latin translation of the Septuagint *juxta Graecos* and later by his *editio juxta Hebraeos*. Jerome testifies to the lacunas, amounting to seven or eight hundred verses, in the Old Latin and the Septuagint, which Origen had supplied from other versions in which the readings, according to Jerome, were often without sense. The number of omissions might be suspected as exaggerated in the foregoing statement were it not that, in the first place, Jerome indicates that the Old-Latin version is more defective and disfigured than the Greek basis, and, in the second place, the statement exceeds only a little the results from stichometric counts. Zahn gives the reckoning for the first form as varying between 1,800, 1,700, and 1,600 stichoi, the last testified by a number of manuscripts, for which the number of the corresponding improved text is 2,200. This last number as a round statement agrees closely with the count of a number of manuscripts and editions, and also with the Masoretic count of the verses of Job as 1,070, which gives 2,140 stichoi, allowing two stichoi to each verse. According to this testimony, the improved Greek was 500 or (according to Hesychius) 600 stichoi longer than the earlier Septuagint; but how this result was reached or upon what basis the statement was made is now unknown. It is further noticeable that the statement refers to a form of the Septuagint which differs from that of Origen. And the situation is further complicated by the fact that the Hexaplar notes transmitted can not be either fully or rightly understood. At any rate, it is possible to affirm that the Job of the old Septuagint was at least a fourth part shorter than the present Hebrew text. The traditional explanation was that a text corresponding to the present lay before the Greek translator, but that the rendering was shortened either by one of the ordinary mishaps attending copying and translation, or purposely because the contents were offensive to the translator, or because the words were not understood, or because the book seemed too long. If it is noted that in many cases corruption is inherent in the Greek text, individual cases are explained upon that ground. But when it is noted that the translator is dexterous in substituting phrases intelligible in Greek for obscure Hebrew phrases and in making the condensed Hebrew luminous by additions, it becomes more difficult to hold that the translator wilfully shortened the text or passed over passages because they were difficult.

On the other hand, it has often been the case that scholars, prejudiced in behalf of the Hebrew, have found in the other Greek versions and in the tradition reaching back to Jerome pure creation, even where the paraphrase is, like that of the Targum, suggested by the Hebrew. Such a passage is vi. 7, where, instead of *orgē*, *hormē* is to be read as the rendering of *naphshi* in the sense of intensity of hunger. The extension of this verse is not to be explained by the introduction of a gloss, but by the attempt in the paraphrase to express clearly the meaning of the original. A similar example is found in the passage iv. 12, where the free translation expresses well, though in expanded form, the original Hebrew, with slight changes in reading.

2. Possible Explanations of Difference of Text.

These and similar cases, of which many might be adduced, show that the Septuagint is an independent and close equivalent, and that, no matter how changed it may be, the translator exercised thought and criticism upon the text which lay before him, which was in very close relationship with that which is now in our possession. This is shown in vi. 6 in which the difficult phrase in the present Hebrew text בריר חלמות was read in the text before the translator of the Septuagint בדברי חלמות. It is to be recognized that alongside of the present Hebrew text, which may be called Palestinian, there was in the fatherland of the Septuagint a second to which the name Egyptian may be applied, and that these had the same parentage. For both of these, the Septuagint in rather extended form, have prologue and epilogue, the omission of the third speech of Zophar for which another by Job is substituted; and both have the speech of Elihu and the same plan of dialogue. In the translation, even when paraphrastic, the correspondence of the Greek with the Hebrew is so close that the text out of which the translation arose can be restored. On the other hand, the Hebrew text has often a longer reading of which at most the rudiments appear in the Egyptian. No a priori decision can be made in either case, for it is a possibility both that the Palestinian text has received additions and that the Egyptian has been abbreviated. It is possible to solve the question in one of two ways. Our Palestinian text may be considered as the last edition of an archetype meant for the Palestinian community, which became the ancestor of the Egyptian Job. The fact that it has certain parts which the Egyptian lacks may be emphasized without attempting to make it a characteristic of the whole. The second way is to discriminate in the Greek Job, after eliminating the corruptions of the Greek as such, between the translation of the Hebrew and the expansion of the translator and to try the resulting text with reference to its congruency and to the impression it makes of deficiency and fragmentariness. Of the Hexapla there are only fragments, and there is no text which gives the Septuagint and that alone; the Sahidic and the Old-Latin Job were translated from Greek manuscripts more or less exactly, but from them it can not be deduced how they were related to the original. Moreover, it appears that the Alexandrian translator was influenced in his understanding by an Aramaic targum (cf. F. Buhl, *Kanon und Text*, p. 171; *TLB*, 1899, pp. 446–447), a fact which further complicates the problem.

3. Parallelism as an Aid to Text-Criticism.

Another help to the recovery of the text is the poetic form based upon the principle of parallelism. The clearly apprehended structure of a first line is a sure indication of the sense and the content of the second, when couplets are in question; but when one passes from the distich and possibly the tristich to the strophe of four, five, or more lines, this canon fails as a help to the recovery of the text or as a test upon which to decide upon the correctness of the text. Moreover, the question of the transmission of the author's text arises, since the task of the editor was to present a text intelligible and instructive to the community, in which it is probable that the matter of metrical and strophical structure was disregarded. Modern studies, also, have too inexact a basis, since the pronunciation and accent of Hebrew is all but unknown, and schemes of strophes presented differ greatly. Moreover, it is improbable that the author would present a uniform meter and strophe in the varying parts of the poem. Thus in chap. iii. the "why" and "wherefore" of verses 11 and 20 divide that chapter into three parts, 3–10, 11–19, 20–26, the first of which has eighteen lines, the second eighteen, but the third only fourteen; further, when in verse 6 "that day" is restored for "that night" (as the sense requires), verses 4–6 give nine lines in three tristichs, devoted to the cursing of the day, while verses 7–10 give as many lines devoted to the cursing of the night, but in distichs, except verse 9 which is a tristich. This change from the tristich to the distich seems to be grounded in the nature of the contents, and Bickell's attempt to do away with the tristich of verse 9 has no basis outside of his preconception. On the other hand, the balance of the first two parts of the chapter raises the question why the last part has only fourteen lines. The answer that we do not know may possibly be deemed sufficient. But on exegetical grounds verse 23 can not be connected with verse 20 and the abrupt introduction of the first person and of the idea of eating in verses 24–26 suggests a loss of two couplets from the text, though neither in the Palestinian text nor in the Egyptian is there a trace that their ancestor possessed them.

The punctuation of the Masoretic text is a most valuable commentary upon Job, and, in view of the great difficulties, an extremely significant one. The passages are many in which the punctuation is indicative of difficulties which the Masorites resolved by seeing in the consonantal text the telescoping of words, as *minlam* in xv. 29 is taken for *min lahem*. The fact that the Masorites made so many mistakes may be explained either as due to false divisions of the unseparated words or to defect in the text as it lay before them. Examples explicable from both causes are at hand.

4. Corruptions of Consonantal Text Explained.

The older consonantal text is to be regarded as the edition (established by an authority of the community) of a text still older which existed in a number of manuscripts, fidelity to which was traversed by a desire to furnish to the community an intelligible text, and, where the exemplar was meaningless or corrupt, to set carefully aside possible shocks to the religious feeling of the reader. Examples of this are found in i. 16–18, where in the exemplar a defective עד was changed to the fully written עוד, while in xxxiv. 23, מֹעֵד, having lost its initial sound through the effect of the closing syllable of the preceding יָשִׂים, was protected against the possible meaning עֵד "witness." A false division in xviii. 20 has been mediated by the introduction of a ו in עֲלֵימוֹ, which was then separated into the two words עַל־יוֹמוֹ The short or abbreviated form of the suffixes and affixes which the earlier scribe used was treated with the greatest freedom and became a potent source of error. In such cases as xiv. 3, xix. 28 (cf. R. V. margin), ix. 19b, the third person is indicated by the parallelism, the logical sequence, and the versions. There are directions in rabbinical instructions which point the same way, as when in xii. 2b the instruction reads: say not *tmwth*, but *twmth*. Changes due to religious timidity are also in evidence. Thus in xxxii. 3c " Job " is substituted for a word which might through changes in the text have been read as " God." Similarly xxxii. 1b, Septuagint, reads " in their eyes," and is justified by logic, since there is no adequate reason in Job's self-justification alone for the silence of the friends. Probably also to the same cause is due the identical expressions in xxxviii. 1, xl. 6, where " out of the whirlwind " is to be explained by the dropping of a word beginning with n after a word ending with the same, which would be represented by the expression " out of the roar of the storm." It is not impossible that by סערה in the passages just cited, differently from the שערה of ix. 17 (where the Targum reads " hair "), was understood not an atmospheric storm, but the theophanic hurricane like that in which Elijah was rapt away. But other causes have brought about changes in the text, such causes as are common in the transmission of all texts of antiquity. In reading the copyist has dropped out a letter or a syllable. Thus in xii. 2 the unintelligible word עם, " people," is doubtless to be explained as the remains of the word הַיֹּדְעִם, and the verse should read: " No doubt ye are the possessors of knowledge, and wisdom shall die with you " (cf. xxxiv. 2). Other mistakes are due to the confusion of letters that look alike, either in the old form or in the square writing, and still others to similarity in sound when the copy was made from dictation. Still another potent source of error are glosses, which have either lengthened the text or made it unintelligible.

5. Early Condition of the Text.

From a view of all these cases it is possible to assert that the Hebrew consonantal text is the edition of a copy which goes back to an archetype, transmitted through we know not how many transcriptions, which was also the original to which the Hebrew text which the Greek translator used is to be traced. This archetype was already characterized by mistakes and corrections, by gaps in the text and by conflate readings. In the course of transmission these changes have been so increased that, in spite of the close general resemblance, in particular passages copies seem altogether foreign to each other. In proportion as we are successful in reconstructing this archetype out of its descendants and in understanding it with its gaps, mistakes, and additions, we approach the form which the poet gave to his work. There is a consensus among modern critics to the effect that the original Job has been enlarged by the insertion of the four speeches of Elihu, chaps. xxxii.–xxxvii. But the circumstance that the surviving text refers neither in the preceding nor in the following parts to the entrance of Elihu (for which preparation could have been made in a few words), which is the chief ground for suspecting the originality of the section, is proof positive that the one who inserted the passage regarded with respect the text to which he made the addition. This is indeed a guaranty that in the earliest times Job was looked on as the inviolable possession of an inspired man for which he himself assumed the responsibility. When it became a book for the community, for which the leading authorities in that community assumed accountability, the liberty was taken of changing it where the interests of instruction of the community seemed to demand it.

III. Plan, Contents, and Purpose: Prior to consideration of the artistic form of the book it is necessary to take up the question of the originality of the Elihu section. The argument from linguistic considerations may be answered by the suggestion that it was prematurely given out and has been corrupted. The consideration that the section brings nothing new against the friends and anticipates what Yahweh is to say is explained by Elihu's different attitude toward Job and his sorrows. On the other hand, in ii. 11–13 only the three friends are mentioned and in xlii. 7–8 reference to them alone is found. Does Elihu belong to the party on whose side the truth is, though he charges Job with adding to his sin that of rebellion (xxxiv. 37), or to those of whom Yahweh demanded repentance?

1. The Elihu Section a Later Addition.

When Yahweh gives his testimony of truth to his servant Job or ignores this judge of Job, nothing more can be meant than that the author of the book and the readers have also ignored Elihu, since neither had in him any interest. In other words, this points to a time when the book of Job was read without the speeches of Elihu, when at the silence of the friends and the last speech of Job God entered to teach and instruct. This is substantiated by the express testimony of Elihu, xxxii. 12–14. Since the friends have nowhere said that Job seemed to have so surpassed them and all men in cleverness that God alone could overcome his error, Elihu must speak under the impression that the intention of the author was to have deity take up the discourse that Job might recognize his folly. Mal. iii. 16 speaks of a book of remembrance caused by Yahweh to be written for discernment between righteous and wicked; and this recalls the fact that Job wished for such a book (xix. 23) and that Elihu (xxxvii. 20) raises the question whether a scribe is noting for Yahweh what he has to say. Elihu comes forward as a man filled with new knowledge. There can be no doubt that he does so on the ground of a newer insight into the instructive meaning of evil for the community gained from the teaching of the prophets and thus comes forward as a young man pushed out from his position of reserve to confront the older men who stand for the old wisdom. Whether the writer who introduced this section wished to identify himself with Elihu or to differentiate himself from him must be decided in favor of the latter supposition by consideration of the stilted vanity of Elihu's introduction of himself, in which he vaunts that he is bringing into view new, weighty, and incontrovertible arguments, by which course he prejudices his hearers against himself. While, then, the innovator introduced Elihu with great promises and then let him conclude in terrified fashion with the statement of the unsearchableness of God (xxxvii. 23), whither the approach of the storm appears to bring him (xxxvii. 1), the conclusion of the original Job so returns to the point reached before the introduction of Elihu as to make it clear that the book of Job rightly understood is not affected by the indirect criticism represented by Elihu. In that case the writer of the section was a man of like spirit with the original poet and the speeches of Elihu are as worthy a place in Scripture as are those of the three friends. But, in taking account of the book of Job in its original form, this part must be put out of account. The meaning of the book with Elihu included can best be seen in Budde, who has used great industry and keenness in attempting to vindicate that section.

2. The Plan.

The real body of the poem is built about the intercourse of the four friends mentioned in ii. 11, from early times regarded as set forth in three sets of speeches (chaps. iii.–xiv., xv.–xxi., xxii.–xxvi.), followed by two addresses of Job (chaps. xxvii.–xxviii., xxix.–xxxi.), after which Yahweh speaks out of the storm (chaps. xxxviii.–xxxix., xl. 6–xli.). Since the author has placed Job's cry of pain (which opens and defines the whole discussion) in close connection with the seven days of silence and since the silence of the friends during that time is intelligible only on the ground that Job first broke that silence, it is reasonable to assume that the first round of speeches filled the first day of the second week, and that each of the two next rounds consumed a day. Such a reckoning is implied in xxiii. 2, where a distinct difference in time is expressed. This helps to explain the similarity of formulas in xxvii. 1 and xxix. 1, different from that in iii. 1, and also the identity of formulas in xxxviii. 1, xl. 6. The reader was expected to understand that the two speeches of Job in xxvii.–xxxi. occupied the fourth and fifth days, while the admonitions of Yahweh occupied the sixth and seventh days. So that the seven days of silence, the tortures of which led Job to curse his life, are carefully balanced against the seven days of speech, at the end of which Job yields humble submission. Theodore of Mopsuestia rightly compared Job to the drama of the Greeks in which the speeches of the characters owe their origin to the art of the poet. To criticisms of the treatment it may be said that the range of the poem reveals to the ear the tones of an inner life, that a stream out of experience is flowing in our presence which at length reaches the appointed end of its course. In vi. 2–7 Job abandons the cry of pain of chap. iii. as an error forced from him by the very fever of his sorrow, that over against the argumentation which had so shocked his friends he protests solemnly in xxvii.–xxviii. his willingness to persevere in piety as the basis of life, and, at the conclusion of the contrast between former happiness and present misfortune (which is in spite of his good conscience toward God and men), he reveals his heart's desire for the living God.

3. The Religion of Job and His Friends.

Job is no prophet receiving his instruction direct from God; he gets his religious instruction from men and with it a limitation of thought and judgment from which he is freed only by his experience of God (xlii. 5), through seeing him with his own eyes. His earlier experiences do not appear as falsity, but only as incompleteness. The religion of Job and his friends is not a folk-religion, but that of the wise, so far as an orderly view of the world goes, and it may be compared with that of (say) Plutarch and Seneca. God is the incomparably wise and mighty one, the creator, the pattern of morals who has ordered life and its penalties for evil. Man who is born of woman is bound up in native sinfulness, his life-course is marked out and comprises a period of growth, of activity in work, and of enjoyment which makes that life worthful. There is implanted in man knowledge of the right way of using life, knowledge also of God as creator and giver of all good. Correct appreciation of this knowledge is the pivot upon which move right and wrong, good fortune and bad, as the direct reaction of righteous or evil acts. And at the end, after the enjoyment of a satisfied life, he is brought to the rest of the grave like the wheat which is gathered to the garner after it has reached the end of its being. Such a view tells of a simple mode of life in a primitive community, where the paterfamilias is directly responsible to God for his household and its ordering, and where the complexities of later society and world-empire had not yet entered. Judgment is drawn from standard facts and concatenations of circumstances as to the rule of God over man. Man the individual is brought into connection with his successors in life, and thus the time period in which the heaven of divine righteousness returns is prolonged beyond the death of the individual. The present good fortune of the evil is balanced by the greatness of final loss, the sorrow of the good is compensated by the overbalancing good of man's final end. This conception has close relations with the religion of Israel, and the speeches of the three friends may be put alongside the didactic Psalms. But great elements of the religion of Israel are lacking, those which relate to the world-purpose of Israel's being and the full balancing of the great day of Yahweh. Still there is to be discovered the firm grip of the idea of God as a living personality and of man as being so related to him as to find therein possibilities of joy; there is also a firm faith in God as the one in whom the course of nature is fixed. A limitation which must be observed, however, is the view of death and the life beyond, which seems to place the soul deprived of God for endless time in absolute darkness. Though even here the trust in God which shines through the book points to a possibility of the developments which were reached in other parts of Scripture.

But how shall the primitive irrational dogma of the end of man's relationship with God at death be shaken and faith be raised to a basis of confident verity? Clearly by presenting the case of one who has faith, whose conduct in the fear of God, in self-instruction, righteousness, and charity is universally known, but who, in the midst of an unwonted accumulation of misfortunes inflicted by divine decrees which deprive him of his dearest and best, after he has bowed to the stroke and has been afflicted personally with a terrible illness, appears to man to be delivered over to judgment, whose faith even brings a conflict into his own soul, which faith, short and defective as it was, is given up for a better.

4. Genuineness of the Prologue.

The problem before the author therefore took flesh and blood; Job appears as the hero and is himself the problem. Whoever has caught the connection of the seven days of silence of the introduction and the seven days of the dialogue will be prepared to see in the introduction and in the poem the work of a single hand. A recent hypothesis sees in chaps. i.–ii. and xlii. the remains of an independent "folk-book." And this view has led to interesting developments, in the course of which attempts were made to discover how this book handled the problem. It has been thought that Ezekiel knew it, while it was held that the poet of the dialogue was later than Ezekiel. Parts of this theory are not entirely new. While Pseudo-Origen regarded the poem as older than Moses, who (according to him) wrote the prologue, it was probably the authority of Theodore which led Junilius to place Job among the historical books. Theodore thought that the historical Job could not have spoken the irrational curses of chap. iii. nor have given to his daughter the heathen name Keren-happuch. Yet it seems impossible for a right understanding of the speeches to take the two parts for anything but the necessary work of the same author. The opening of the drama in the changing of scene between heaven and earth, the presentation of the secret divine counsel preceding the events, and the conduct of men following them betray the same hand as the dialogue. Evidences of the intent of the author to model the narrative after the *mashal* exist in the monotony of the reiteration of the four misfortunes by the messengers (i. 13 sqq.), and in the repetitions of i. 6, and ii. 1, of i. 11, and ii. 5, of 1, 7, and ii. 2, while the introduction of the reader to the scenes in heaven serves the same purpose as the prologues of Euripides in giving him the key to the action of the persons in the drama. There is a correspondence also in the religion of Job and his friends in the dialogue and the position assigned them as Edomites, therefore nearly related to Israel, with an ancestor brother to Jacob, consequently heir of Abraham and his religion, but without the special promises which were Israel's, while the hero as a shepherd-prince reproduces the life of the patriarchs. Further correspondence is found in particular incidents, such as the sin-offering of Job for his children (i. 5) and the curt rejection by Job of his wife's advice to curse God and die (ii. 9), with Job's reiterated claim to right speech (vi. 10, xxiii. 11–12) and with Bildad's statement that the death of Job's children was punishment for the sin they had committed (viii. 4).

A large element in the supposition that prologue and epilogue are from a folk-book is doubtless the figure of Satan which corresponds to the Satan of folk-lore, the thought that as Goethe drew his Faust from the book of Dr. Faustus, so our poet borrowed his figure. But the analogy does not hold. Job and his friends know nothing of a Satan or that he is Job's foe. The friends think that God is Job's foe, and so thinks Job; they know nothing of the council in heaven. But the heavenly council and the figure of Satan correspond to the representation of Hebrew prophecy, while the relations of God to man, spirit, and the world at large are those of the Old Testament. Not folk-lore, but the current ideas of revelation in Israel are the basis of the presentation. So the creation of man and his expulsion from Eden were the result of a heavenly council (Gen. i. 26, iii. 22). But Job and Adam may be regarded as counterparts. Job recognizes that God has simply used the rights of a creator in depriving him of the free gifts bestowed (i. 21); Adam yielded to his wife's suggestion, Job refused the leading of his wife toward the same end (ii. 10).

5. Satan in the Prologue and in Other Scripture.

The Fall was the work of the serpent who would persuade man that the creator was a jealous tyrant and would also destroy God's pleasure in his creation; in Job Satan begrudges Yahweh the joy he has in his pious servant and seeks to produce in Job the same idea of God as a tyrant; the purpose, however, is exposed in the prologue in the part Satan takes in the heavenly council. In any case the magnificent view of the world, one which entirely lacks the qualities of folk-lore presentations, which makes God's many-sided wisdom crown the climax of creation in the creation of man, which he justifies to the spirits who watch the work in wonder, is rooted in Gen. i.–iii. Inherent in the contest between Satan and God is the assumption of partiality in deity in that he sought by unearned gifts to win man for himself (Adam), in that he guards from attacks of misfortune by prosperity the man represented as pious (Job), when man has fallen he saves him as a brand from the burning (Joshua in Zech. iii.), and that now his impartiality must come out in the calamities of Job that the enemy may be silenced. Indeed, there is a reminiscence of the creation story in the "enmity" between the seed of the woman and of the serpent in the play upon the name of Job (איוב) and אויב, "enemy" of Job xiii. 24 (cf. xix. 11); but the prologue shows that the enemy is not God but Satan. The marks of derivation of the prologue from folk-lore are wholly lacking.

Are the sorrows of Job a punishment, a chastisement, or a trial? and what would the poet teach by them? Since the prologue ascribes to God knowledge of Job's purity, to Satan doubt of it, it might be held that the purpose is to use Job as a witness to show the lying nature and impotence of Satan (cf. Budde). It is a curiosity that some have seen in the book of Job the question opened whether there is an unrewarded piety. But men believe in God because faith makes them blessed; blessedness is not the wages of faith, but the living activity of the God set forth in faith, the very essence of which is that he is the cause of blessedness in man.

6. The Purpose.

It is the greatest folly to speak of an uninterested piety, since piety is the prophecy of the highest interest of the soul which is created by and for God. Job does not regret his lost sheep and camels as if they were the due of his piety; but he longs for a gracious God. The poet has placed Job outside the region where God's promises held and in a realm where individual faith was compelled to overcome the obstacles of experience and a view beyond death was not possible. Satan's plea is that if God cuts Job loose from ancestral rules of guidance, Job will cast God under his feet. But Job's entire course of action proves that his fear of God was rooted in his inner life. The death of Job would have convicted Satan of lying, but would have left a puzzle for Job's contemporaries. But the poet has not introduced a third scene in heaven corresponding to the two first in which Satan might be represented as saying that a living dog is better than a dead lion (Eccles. ix. 4). The poem would have needed then to deal with the world beyond the grave, which would have been against poetic canons. The makers of the catenæ remarked that God had left room on this side for the rehabilitation of his pious sufferer before the resurrection.

The trial of Job is not in order that he may turn away from his wife's suggestion of impiety and patiently depend upon the divine, nor that he may disown his first outbreak of impatience. A severer trial comes when authorities upon faith and religion, teachers of it as he had been a teacher (iv. 3), decide that his sorrows are the result of his own wrong-doing; the very faith in which he had lived and of which he had been an exponent is turned against himself as a proof of his own impiety.

7. Organic Interconnection of Dialogue and Narrative.

According to the common belief implied in the poem, the narrow part of the universe within the ken of mortals makes clear the righteousness of the world-ruler, while the result of man's life is the expression of man's worth before God. Job could not deny his own godly fear and fidelity; similarly God had not changed without right reasons. If, as the friends might maintain, God had formerly seemed favorable, only to emphasize and intensify his real disfavor to be manifested later, Job only sighed the more for a gracious God whose image he cherished in his heart, whose truth had been his guaranty in Job's early blessedness. He can not dismiss the idea of a righteous God who knows his innocence; the sharper the argument of his adversaries, the more necessary that idea became. It is incomprehensible how one can assert (with Laue) that in his speeches Job has completed his apostasy in view of the fact that when, at the end of the dialogue, the friends are confounded, the poet has put into Job's mouth a solemn oath that he will hold fast to that virtue and righteousness in which he had felt himself blessed, even though he had not solved the riddle of his suffering (xxvii. 2 sqq.).

The prophetic idea of a theophany or vision is employed by the poet to exhibit the divine counsel in intelligible form. Job lives in a region not of revealed but of natural religion where man sees in a glance the totality of natural phenomena in their living eternal basis, and, uplifted by this intuition of the movement of these phenomena, becomes aware of the voice of God. But this could not explain Job's experience; the plot forbade this, since Satan must not be permitted to call "foul play."

8. Result of the Divine Admonitions.

Job's sufferings must be endured under the same conditions as those in which his aspersed piety had existed. He experienced nothing which might not have come in the natural course of things; but the combination of events brought before him God's all-power in the world (xlii. 2 sqq.). Then God reestablished him in the position of a servant and witness of the truth, with which fact and with Job's intercession he bound up the exemption of the three friends from punishment, a significant indication that their sin consisted in their persecution of Job. Job acted as the intimate friend of God when he prayed for the friends; as such they recognized him whom they had previously regarded as a rebel from God. Job, too, learned that God was far greater and mightier and more an object of faith than he had supposed in the exercise of his earlier faith.

In chap. vi. Job explains his wild outburst in chap. iii. as due to the unendurable weight of his visitation which robs his soul of peace because the hope of coming alleviation which belongs to faith is made impossible by the unchecked diminution of his physical strength. He can not therefore regard his sorrows as those of a short period which will be superseded by a period of restoration, as his piety had hitherto bidden him do. To the impossibility of restoration on this side the grave is added the consideration that death withdraws man from the eye and hand of God (vii. 6–10). Yet the experience of faith teaches that God's wrath exhausts itself and the mood of pity for the creature finds place. Will not the approach of death wake up this pity in God (vii. 8, 21) for the work of his hand (x. 8–13)?

9. Job's Attempt to Comprehend His Misfortunes.

Can God, who has created man and who knows him thoroughly and his sin, refuse to exercise forgiveness (vii. 21), and will he demand absolute responsibility (xiv. 3) of so poor a creature? What value for God must a being have for whose purification he has so great concern? Shall not man think that, when death has completed his penance and God's wrath is exhausted (xiv. 13), God's yearning for his creation will cause him to awaken that creation to new life in communion with him (xiv. 7, 8, 13–15)? In that case Job's hope would make him endure to the very end (xiv. 14). It may be thought that Job is on the way here to extend his old faith to the point where death itself is included in the region of suffering after which God's help comes, and not merely in his particular case, but as a general fact (cf. xiv. 10, 12 with 14a). But this idea must give way in the face of his postulate that death is a final judgment which excludes man from fellowship with God (xiv. 20, cf. Gen. iii. 23). The poet has let Job discover a better ground of hope for the conquest of death than the thought of the philosophers from Plato to Leibnitz, who found basis for such a hope in the indestructibility of the indivisible and immaterial soul. Job's reason is the ethical yearning of God for man, who is worthful to God as the work of his hand.

The vexed soul of Job makes still other attempts in the consciousness that he may not hope for restoration here, since he counts himself as already belonging to the world of the dead whither his hopes and his expectations may not accompany him (xvii. 13–16). His friends charge him with demanding that the course of nature be changed for his benefit (xviii. 4), but his thoughts, when allowed full course, do change night into day. He protests anew his innocence, while exhausting the category of his sufferings in which nevertheless he seems to have been treated as actually the sinner his friends believe he must be (xvii. 7–17), in spite of the witness he has within the mystery of heaven (19–21).

10. Job's Ultimate Position.

God might, he thinks, at the end of life, halt the processes of decomposition and disintegration in order by this unusual phenomenon to arouse the thought that Job's case was special and so an explanation of his lot be brought about. But he remembers that he has already become to mankind a sort of monstrosity which confounds the pious (xvii. 6). His final appeal must be to God, confidence in whom still remains in his breast (xix. 23–27). A connection is conceived between what God does here on earth in order to purify the thought of the pious and the state of the soul abiding in Hades (verses 28–29). There is a living religious certainty of a righteous God and of a personal relationship to him possessed by the pious. Account must be taken of the criticism which is exercised upon the dogma of a visible justification of a righteous God on this side of death. The apparent good fortune of the wicked is not requited through the eventual misfortune of his descendants; he himself ought to bear his punishment, but he is snatched away before evil comes upon his children (xxi. 7–21). When the same lot of death befalls the lucky tyrant and the unfortunate poor, how can man affirm that through their hap God teaches men what is right (xxi. 22–34)? By the question in xxiv. 1 and in the reflections suggested Job intimates that he would be able to understand the inactive watching by deity of the raging of tyrants and the suffering of the innocent if human history ran in cycles in which exact requital was discerned. But this the Israelite could do, having the compensations of the " day of Yahweh " in view—a thought to which Job's heart instinctively turns. And the poet attempted to widen and deepen the old faith in God when he allowed God to decide that Job, in contrast with his friends, had spoken the thing that was right, meaning by this not Job's affirmations of innocence, but the considerations which led him to hold that not even the world of the dead and the burial of man therein could deprive man of the proof of that God who is man's final blessedness.

IV. The Author and the Time of Composition: The book neither names its author nor gives data regarding its authorship, and there is no independent tradition respecting either. Its date has been placed all the way along the ages from Moses to the Persian times. The apocryphal conception made Job and the Edomitic king Jobab the same person and made Moses the author. The thought that the book belonged to Solomonic times, entertained from Chrysostom to Delitzsch, rests upon the statement that the wisdom of the Israel of that time exceeded the wisdom of the East with which Job is connected (i. 3) and upon correspondences between Job's thought and that of Solomonic proverbs; but such wisdom did not die with Solomon. Attempts have been made to prove Job the personification of suffering Israel in Assyrian times or under Manasseh. Neither the orthography of the book nor the linguistic features give sure indications of the date, since emendations and changes have appeared in so great numbers as to vitiate the argument, and there is also no history of the Hebrew language sufficiently minute to make the language a criterion. And the relation of the religious ideas of the book afford no better test, since the date when certain notions became dominant does not exclude the possibility that such ideas were held at other times. The supposed datum, given by the connection of the idea of Satan with the same idea in two other passages of Scripture, loses sight of the fact that Biblical literature is the remains of a larger literature which, if extant, might give a different basis. The only means which might enable one to fix the date of the book would be its literary relationship to other dated books. Undated Scriptures, like the introduction to Proverbs or the Hexateuch or its parts, must be left out of account. To the dated books belong Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Between the way in which Jeremiah curses his birth (xx. 14) and the expressions in Job iii. there is an indisputable connection. But the decision as to priority may lie in subjective considerations. Note, however, that Ezekiel speaks of Job as being as well known to his companions as Noah and Daniel. Here again some say that not our book but a Job of folk-lore is referred to. It is noticeable, however, that Ezekiel is concerned with the problem of the righteous judgment of God, which is one of the problems of Job. In any case it is not forbidden to assume that Malachi had this book in his eye (iii. 16), that Ezekiel knew it, and that Jeremiah had the bitter complaint of Job in his mind. Delitzsch has emphasized the touching wail of the leper of Ps. lxxxviii. (cf. Job vi. 8) ascribed to Heman of whom I Chron. xxv. 5 says that he was seer to the king and that God gave him fourteen sons and five daughters. It has seemed strange that those who argue for an old folk-book have not connected the two, especially since the doubling of Job's possessions implied fourteen and not seven sons. But the Chronicler has made no such connection, and the fact that Heman wrote a poem which strikes the same note as the book of Job does not warrant the assumption that our book is the expansion of it. It may be said, however, that the origin of the book of Job lies on this side of Heman and in close relationship with that which is said of him; nothing further can be affirmed respecting the author nor can the time of its origin be closely defined.

(August Klostermann.)

Bibliography: Texts of value are by A. Merx, Jena, 1871; S. Baer, Leipsic, 1875; G. Bickell, in *Carmina veteris*

testamenti, pp. 150–187, Innsbruck, 1882 (goes into metrody and strophical structure); G. Hoffmann, Kiel, 1891; C. Siegfried, in *SBOT*, 1893; G. Beer, 2 vols., Marburg, 1895–97 (critical and of great value); B. Duhm, Göttingen, 1897; *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vols. vi.–vii. (critical unpointed text, with directions for reading in Latin); and in the new *Biblia Hebraica* of R. Kittel, Leipsic, 1905–06. The Sahidic version was edited by Ciasca in *Sacrorum bibliorum fragmenta Copto-Sahidica*, Rome, 1889 (has a rich introduction; cf. Amélineau in *TSBA*, ix. 2, 1893, 5 sqq.). A Greek edition is by P. de Lagarde in his *Mittheilungen*, ii. 189 sqq., Göttingen, 1887.

Earlier commentaries are by Brentius, Halle, 1546; Johannes de Spineda, Madrid, 1597; A. Schultens, Leyden, 1737; C. F. Houbigant, *Notae criticae in universos veteris testamenti libros*, Frankfort, 1777; I. J. Reiske, Leipsic, 1779; M. H. Stuhlmann, Hamburg, 1804; J. W. C. Umbreit, Heidelberg, 1824; E. B. Köster, Schleswig, 1831. More modern ones are by H. Ewald, *Dichter des alten Bundes*, vol. iii., Göttingen, 1836, Eng. transl., London, 1897; S. Lee, London, 1837; J. G. Stickel, Leipsic, 1842; K. Schlottmann, Berlin, 1851; L. Hirzel, ed. Olshausen, Leipsic, 1852; J. G. Vaihinger, Stuttgart, 1856; T. J. Conant, New York, 1857; E. Renan, Paris, 1859, Eng. transl., London, 1889; A. B. Davidson, vol. i., London, 1862 (never completed, philological, an excellent piece of work); idem, in Cambridge Bible, 1884 (perhaps the best in English); Franz Delitzsch, Leipsic, 1876, Eng. transl. of 1st ed., Edinburgh, 1869 (the introduction is very valuable, gives a history of the exegesis of the book); F. C. Cook, in *Bible Commentary*, London, 1873; O. Zöckler, in Lange's Commentary, Eng. transl., New York, 1874; E. W. Hengstenberg, Leipsic, 1875; C. P. Robinson, London, 1876; D. Thomas, ib. 1879; S. Cox, ib. 1880; G. H. B. Wright, ib. 1883; G. G. Bradley, *Lectures on the Book of Job*, Oxford, 1887; W. Volck, Munich, 1889; A. Dillmann, Leipsic, 1891; R. A. Watson, in *Expositor's Bible*, London, 1892; K. Budde, Göttingen, 1896; B. Duhm, Freiburg, 1897; E. C. S. Gibson, London, 1889; Friedrich Delitzsch, Leipsic, 1902; M. Pritchard, London, 1903; D. Davies, vol. i., London, 1909.

On the metrics consult: J. H. A. Ebrard, *Das Buch Hiob als poetisches Kunstwerk*, Landau, 1858; P. Vetter, *Die Metrik des Buches Hiob*, in Bardenhewer's *Biblische Studien*, ii. 4, Freiburg, 1897; J. Ley, *Die metrische Beschaffenheit des Buches Hiob*, in *TSK*, 1895, 1899; E. Kautzsch, *Die Poesie und die poetischen Bücher des A. T.*, Tübingen, 1902.

On critical and other questions related to the book consult: G. Bickell, *De indole ac ratione versionis Alexandrinae*, Marburg, 1862; J. A. Froude, in *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, London, 1867; W. H. Green, *Argument of the Book of Job*, New York, 1874; K. Budde, *Beiträge zur Kritik des Buches Hiob*, Bonn, 1876; F. Giesebrecht, *Der Wendepunkt des Buches Hiob*, Greifswald, 1879; T. K. Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, London, 1887; E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, ib. 1889 (on the Septuagint); J. F. Genung, *The Epic of the Inner Life, the Book of Job*, Boston, 1891; W. T. Davison, in *Wisdom Literature of the O. T.*, London, 1893 (a luminous treatment); L. Laue, *Komposition des Buches Hiob*, Halle, 1895; G. Beer, in *ZATW*, xvi (1896), 297 sqq., xvii (1897), 97 sqq., xviii (1898), 257 sqq. (deals with all the versions); J. Owen, *Five Great Skeptical Dramas*, New York, 1896; G. V. Garland, *Problems of Job*, London, 1898; R. G. Moulton, in *Literary Study of the Bible*, Boston, 1899; M. Jastrow, *Babylonian Parallels to Job*, in *JBL*, xxv. 2 (1906); *DB*, ii. 660–671; *EB*, ii. 2464–2491; *JE*, vii. 193–200.

JOBSON, FREDERICK JAMES: English Wesleyan; b. at Northwich (17 m. e.n.e. of Chester), Cheshire, July 6, 1812; d. in London Jan. 4, 1881. He served an apprenticeship to an architect of Norwich, but in 1834 entered the Wesleyan ministry. He was located at Patrington, Yorkshire, in 1834, and at Manchester 1835–37. In the latter year he went to London as assistant at the City Road Chapel. In 1856 he was sent by the British conference to the Methodist Episcopal Conference at Indianapolis, Ind., and in 1860 to the conference at Sydney, Australia. As book steward of the Wesleyan Methodist organization 1864–79 he greatly extended the publishing-business of his denomination. For twelve years he superintended the *Methodist Magazine*. In 1869 he was elected president of the Wesleyan Methodist conference. His principal works are, *Chapel and School Architecture* (London, 1850); *A Mother's Portrait* (1855); *America and American Methodism* (1857); *Australia; with Notes by the Way on Egypt, Ceylon, Bombay, and the Holy Land* (1862); *Perfect Love for Christian Believers* (1864); *Serious Truths for Consideration* (1864); and *Visible Union with the Church of Christ* (1864). A number of his sermons were printed in B. Gregory's *Life of F. J. Jobson* (London, 1884).

Bibliography: Besides the Life by Gregory, ut sup., consult the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*, Sept. 1844, June 1871, and 1881, pp. 150–157, 176–185, 285–294, 397; *DNB*, xxix. 396.

JOCELIN, jos′e-lin: A Cistercian monk of Furness Abbey (in northwestern Lancashire, west of Morecambe Bay) and later of Down in North Ireland. He flourished about 1200 and is noteworthy for his lives of saints, especially his *Life of St. Kentigern* (ed. A. P. Forbes, Edinburgh, 1874) and the *Life and Miracles of St. Patrick* (published by Colgan in the *Trias thaumaturga*, Louvain, 1647, 64–116, and in the *ASB*, Mar., ii. 540–580; Eng. transl. by E. L. Swift, Dublin, 1809).

JOCH, yōh, **JOHANN GEORG:** German Protestant theologian; b. at Rothenburg (31 m. s.s.e. of Würzburg) Dec. 27, 1677; d. at Wittenberg Oct. 1, 1731. He is noted in the ecclesiastical history of his time as an ardent champion of pietistic teachings in the two strongholds of orthodox Lutheran theology, Dortmund and Wittenberg. At Jena, where he studied from 1697 to 1709, he became an enthusiastic follower of Spener, and when he was made superintendent and gymnasiarch at Dortmund in the latter year, he applied himself to the performance of his duties in the spirit of pietism. He found a demoralized and materialistic clergy, devoted solely to dogmatism and polemics, and at once began a struggle for regeneration by means of pietistic assemblies and the institution of catechism classes. This brought him into conflict with his clerical colleagues, but he enjoyed the support of the municipal authorities until he alienated them by his attacks upon them. In 1722 he became head preacher at Erfurt, and in 1726 was appointed professor of theology at Wittenberg, where his advent was the signal for the outbreak of a long controversy in which the cause of Pietism made little headway. Joch was a prolific writer in various fields, but his productions, almost without exception, were pamphlets of little permanent value.

(E. Ideler.)

Bibliography: C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien*, vi. 236, 473 sqq., 11 vols., Leipsic, 1762–85; J. C. W. Augusti, *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Statistik der evangelischen Kirche*, i. 164–231, Jena, 1837.

JOEL: The second of the Minor Prophets in the arrangement of the English version. Little is known of the prophet; he was the son of Pethuel, probably a Judahite, and prophesied in Jerusalem; but that he was a Levite does not follow from i. 9,

Date.

13, ii. 17. By most scholars his date is placed in the reign of Joash between 875 and 845 B.C. on the ground that Amos used his book, that the descent of the Edomites upon Judah under Joash was fresh in his memory, and that his mention of temple, priests, and ritual necessitates that early date. Others place him in the times of Jeroboam II. and Uzziah, others under Ahaz and Hezekiah, still others in the last years of Josiah, while several recent critics put him in Persian or Greek times. Against a post-exilic dating are the following considerations: The position of the book in the Hebrew and Greek canon is among the early prophets and before those of the Chaldean period. Among the peoples named in the book there appear neither Syrians, Greeks, Persians, Babylonians, nor Assyrians, not even Moabites or Ammonites, but only Philistines, Phenicians, Egyptians, and Edomites. Nothing follows from silence respecting a king and the northern kingdom. Against the assertion that iii. 2 and 6 imply the Babylonian or an Assyrian captivity, it is to be noted that neither Babylonians nor Assyrians are mentioned; Philistines and Phenicians are the chief foes in iii. 4 (cf. II Chron. xxi. 16–17, where Philistines and Arabians are said to have aided Jerusalem in the time of Jehoram, and II Kings viii. 22). Characteristic are the "parting of the land" and the selling of Judean prisoners of war to foreign peoples, a practise of the Phenicians (F. C. Movers, *Die Phönizier*, ii. 3, 70 sqq., Bonn, 1845), who, by the ninth century, were in commercial contact with the Greeks. The mention of Egypt in iii. 19 may be connected with the expedition of Shishak of I Kings xiv. 25 under Rehoboam. Against this the "bring again the captivity" of iii. 1 can not be urged, since in post-exilic times this phrase means to restore and not to return captives; and that Judah and Jerusalem needed restoration when the northern tribes had revolted, had assailed the capital, annexed Judean territory, and sold captives into slavery no one will deny. The conception of the book that Jerusalem was the legitimate sanctuary is no proof of late origin, since Isaiah and Micah have the same idea (Isa. ii. 2; Mic. i. 2). Similarly, Joel's attitude to the priesthood finds analogies in early prophetic books. The linguistic test can not be employed, since it gives no sure results. But more decisive is the unquestionable dependence of Amos on Joel (cf. Amos i. 2, 9, 13 with Joel iii. 16, 18), while the *gazam* of Amos iv. 9 is repeated only in Joel i. 4, ii. 25, and is not dependent in Joel upon Amos. If Joel is placed in the early years of Joash when Jehoiada was influential, the attitude toward the priests is fully explained.

Contents.

The occasion of the book was a dire plague of locusts, accompanied by a severe drought, the results and course of which are described i. 2–ii. 17, resulting in the prophet's call to fasting and repentance. This fast must have been observed, since in the second and remaining part of the book promises of good abound, relating to the immediate and the distant future. The immediate outlook is the defeat of the foe, healing and good fortune, so that Zion rejoices in its God; in the distant future (ii. 28) Yahweh's spirit is to come on all flesh, making all prophecy superfluous, while Zion is to dwell in security. Its foes are to be gathered, a hostile army, for judgment, and amid terrifying upheavals of nature are to be reaped like a ripe harvest. The book closes (iii. 18–21) with blessing upon Judah and Jerusalem and promise of destruction for their foes. The articulation of the book is good and its parts are well related. The Day of Yahweh, which in the first part appears as one of terror unless repentance supervenes, is in the second part a day of grace because that repentance has come. Against Merx, the hostile peoples are not all mankind, but the immediate neighbors of Judah, those who, in accordance with the law of prophecy, were in the ken of the prophet, viz., Tyre, Sidon, and Philistia. This issues, however, in chap. iii. in the distinction between Israel as God's people and the people of the world who are foes of God, a representation which is repeated in Zech. xiv. 2. The place of judgment of the world is the Valley of Jehoshaphat, made memorable by the event narrated in II Chron. xx. 22–26, a place which recalled not only Jehoshaphat but a noted judgment upon Judah's foes.

The plague of locusts is to be taken literally, not metaphorically. The metaphoric interpretation depends largely upon the fact that one of the names for locusts in the Masoretic pointing means "northern," and Judah's enemies were northern, while the locusts usually came from the south. But swarms are sometimes brought from the northern Syrian desert by a northeast wind. Moreover, the prediction in ii. 20 is applicable to a swarm of locusts driven into the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean, not to a human enemy. There is no ground for denying to the prophet the composition of the book as a whole; the unity becomes clear when it is seen that the phenomena of the first part are the basis of the rest (ii. 28–iii. 21). (W. VOLCK†.)

It is now no longer possible to say, with the late writer of the above article, that most scholars place the date of Joel "in the reign of Joash between 875 and 845 B.C." [Joash of Judah really reigned from 836 to 797 B.C.] It has been well said that "the book is either very early or very late," and recent critics almost unanimously place it in the fourth century B.C., though a few still regard it as the earliest of the prophetical writings. In answer to the arguments for the older view it may be said: (1) It is more likely that Joel, e.g. in iii. 16, 18, borrowed from Amos than that Amos, e.g., in i. 2, ix. 13, borrowed from Joel, for the former passages are brought close together as would naturally be done in a reproduction of earlier thoughts. (2) The attacks of the Edomites upon Judah (cf. iii. 19), during the helplessness of the latter just before and for centuries after the exile, finally resulted in their actual annexation of the country even to the north of Hebron; and it is these relations with Edom which form the chief subject of prophetic references (see Ob. i. 8; Jer. xlix. 7, 17, 20; Ezek. xxv. 12, 14, xxxii. 29; Mal. i. 4) to that inveterate enemy of Judah. (3) There is no allusion to the kingdom of northern Israel. (4) The detailed references to the priesthood and the temple offerings and services (i. 9, 13, 14, ii. 14–17) suggest the later period of Jewish church influence rather than the days of prophetic independence. (5) The exile and dispersion and foreign occupation seem to be presupposed in iii. 2, 17. (6) The allusion to the "Grecians" (iii. 6) is best accounted for by the effects of the Macedonian régime in Asia. (7) The strongest argument for a late date is the apocalyptic character of the book from ii. 28 to the end, the general indefiniteness of the historical background, and lack of specific allusion to contemporary events and situations which forms such a striking feature of the earlier prophets.

J. F. McCurdy.

Bibliography: The two best commentaries are by S. R. Driver, in *Cambridge Bible*, 1897, and G. A. Smith, *The Book of the Twelve*, London, 1898. Other commentaries are by: A. F. Holzhausen, Hanover, 1829; C. A. Credner, Halle, 1831; E. Meier, Tübingen, 1841; A. Wünsche, Leipsic, 1872 (gives bibliography of Joel to 1872); E. Montet, Geneva, 1877; A. Merx, Halle, 1879 (gives history of interpretation down to Calvin); F. Hitzig, ed. J. Steiner, Leipsic, 1881; A. Scholz, Würzburg, 1885; C. F. Keil, Leipsic, 1888; E. le Savoureux, Paris, 1888; G. Preuss, Halle, 1889; J. Wellhausen, *Die kleinen Propheten*, pp. 56 sqq., 207 sqq., Berlin, 1892; C. von Orelli, in *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*, 3d ed., Munich, 1908, Eng. transl. of earlier ed., *The Twelve Minor Prophets*, Edinburgh, 1893; W. Nowack, Göttingen, 1897; I. T. Beck, ed. J. Lindenmeyer, Gütersloh, 1898; J. Hyde, London, 1898; E. B. Pusey, *Minor Prophets*, reissue, London, 1906; A. C. Gaeberlin, ib., 1909.

Questions of date, unity, genuineness, etc., are treated in the works on Biblical Introduction, such as Driver's, and in the commentaries. Special treatises are: H. Grätz, *Der einheitliche Charakter der Prophetie Joels*, Breslau, 1873; W. L. Pearson, *The Prophecy of Joel: its Unity, its Aim, and the Age of its Composition*, New York, 1885; G. Kessner, *Das Zeitalter des Propheten Joel*, Leipsic, 1888; H. Holzinger, in *ZATW*, 1889, pp. 89–131; F. W. Farrar, *The Minor Prophets*, London, 1890; G. B. Gray, in *Expositor*, Sept., 1893; G. G. Findlay, *Books of the Prophets*, London, 1896; *DB*, ii. 672–676; *EB*, ii. 2492–2497; *JE*, vii. 204–208.

JOHANN, yō'hān, **JOHANNES**, yō'hān-nêz. See John.

JOHANNES III. SCHOLASTICUS: Patriarch of Constantinople; b. at Sirimis (near Antioch); d. probably Aug. 31, 577.

The Patriarch Eutychius (q.v.) having been banished on account of his firm attitude against Aphthartodocetism (see Justinian), Justinian appointed to succeed him, in Jan., 565, Johannes, deputy of the Patriarch Anastasius of Antioch. Before becoming a cleric, Johannes had been a lawyer. According to John of Ephesus (*Hist. Eccl.*, i. and ii.), he was an unsparing oppressor of the Monophysites of the capital. After severe illness, he died in the twelfth year of the Emperor Justin II., whose favor he had enjoyed. Johannes was the author of (1) a "collection of canons," and this while still a presbyter of Antioch; also (2) a legal canon (Justellus, *Bibliotheca Juris canonici veteris*, 2 vols., Paris, 1661, ii. 499–672). The former treatise contains the canons of church councils down to Chalcedon; the latter, the ecclesiastical legislation of the emperors; and both collections are treated systematically. According to Photius (*Bibliotheca*, cod. lxxv., p. 52, ed. Bekker, 2 vols., Berlin, 1824), Johannes wrote a "catechetical discourse" against the tritheism of Johannes Philoponus (q.v.); according to John of Nikiou (ed. by Zotenberg in *JA* 1878, ii. 344), also an "initiation." G. Krüger.

Bibliography: *ASB*, Aug. 1, *67; *DCB*, iii. 366–367; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, xi. 101, xii. 146, 193, 201, 209, Hamburg, 1808–09.

JOHANNES IV. JEJUNATOR: Patriarch of Constantinople; b. in Constantinople; d. Sept. 2, 595. He was a deacon at St. Sophia under the Patriarch Johannes III. Scholasticus (q.v.). While not a learned man, he was distinguished for devout works and for his extended fasts, whence his name Jejunator. On April 12, 582, he succeeded Eutychius (q.v.) as patriarch of Constantinople, and stood in high esteem with the Emperors Tiberius and Mauritius. He is commemorated as a saint by the Greek Church on September 2.

He is known in ecclesiastical history for his controversy with Popes Pelagius II. and Gregory I. In the proceedings of a synod held at Constantinople in 588, under his presidency, he is called archbishop and ecumenical patriarch. The first protest against this title was urged by Pelagius (cf. Gregory, *Epist.* v. 41 and v. 44). Some years later Gregory took occasion to rebuke the patriarch's insolence and haughtiness because, by usurping that title, which nobody, not even the Roman pontiff, had ever assumed, he exalted himself above the other bishops. The remonstrance passed unheeded, even when Gregory also addressed the Emperor Mauritius in the matter (Gregory, *Epist.*, v. 37; cf. v. 39). At all events, Gregory's strict decision continued binding for the Church of Rome, which denied to the devout faster the veneration due to a saint.

Gregory was in error if he supposed that Johannes undertook an innovation, for the title was used in the time of Johannes II. the Cappadocian in 518. Still again, Gregory erred in the assumption that his own predecessors had refused the title of universal bishop or patriarch; for the contrary is true in respect to Leo I., Hormisdas, Boniface II., and Agapetus I. Gregory was also probably wrong in construing the title to mean an exaltation of the Byzantine patriarch over all other bishops, including the bishop of Rome, for there are still good reasons for the hypothesis that "ecumenical patriarch" meant "imperial patriarch."

The following writings are extant under the name of Johannes, although none of them date back to him: (1) "Rules and guide in the case of those who make confession" (*MPG*, lxxxviii., 1889–1918; cf. 1931–36); (2) "On repentance, self-control, and virginity" (*MPG*, lxxxviii. 1937–78), also ascribed to Chrysostom; (3) "On false prophets," (among Chrysostom's works, *MPG*, liv., 553–568); (4) "Instruction for nuns and reproof of every kind of sin" (J. B. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, 4 vols., iv., 416–435, Paris, 1858). According to K. Holl (*Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum*, pp. 289 sqq., Leipsic, 1898) the first one was composed by a Cappadocian monk, Johannes, who lived in the Petra cloister at Constantinople about 1100. G. Krüger.

Bibliography: *ASB*, Aug. 1, *69–*74; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, xi. 108–112, Hamburg, 1808; A. J. Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, v. 3, pp. 383–390, Mainz, 1829; A. Pichler, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung zwischen Orient und Occident*, ii. 647–666, Munich, 1865;

J. Hergenrother, *Photius*, i. 178–190, Regensburg, 1867; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, ii. 446 sqq., Bonn, 1885; F. Kattenbusch, *Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Konfessionskunde*, i. 111–117, 262, Freiburg, 1892; K. Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum*, pp. 289–298, Leipsic, 1898; *DCB*, iii. 367–368; and literature under Pelagius II., and Gregory I.

JOHANNES ASKUSNAGES, ɑ̄s-kʊs′nɑ̄-jîz: Greek theologian of the sixth century. He was a pupil of the Syrian Peter of Rhesina, whom he succeeded as teacher of philosophy at Constantinople during the reign of Justinian I. In a conference held in the presence of the emperor, Johannes declared himself not only a monophysite, but a tritheist, and he was accordingly banished as a heretic. Abulfaraj makes Johannes Askusnages the founder of tritheism, but the Greek sources, which ignore this theologian, assign this place to Johannes Philoponos (q.v.), the discrepancy being apparently due to the fact that the latter was the most distinguished representative of the tritheistic doctrine.

(Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien*, viii. 684, 11 vols., Leipsic, 1762–85; Neander, *Christian Church*, ii. 613.

JOHANNES BEKKOS: Patriarch of Constantinople; b. at Constantinople in the early part of the thirteenth century; d. in the castle of St. Gregory in Bithynia 1293. He first became important in the unionistic synod of 1274, when the Emperor Michael Palæologus, a zealous advocate of union, sought his aid as a scholar and orator. Johannes, however, after some hesitation declared the Latins heretics, and was accordingly imprisoned. During his confinement he read the older Greek literature on the controverted points and became convinced of the truth of what he had hitherto rejected. The consequence was his elevation to the patriarchal throne, but the change in ecclesiastical policy resulted in his deposition in 1282 and his banishment in the following year. His final years were spent in prison. The Greek Church has stricken the name of Bekkos from the list of the orthodox, but his polemical writings were included in the *Graecia orthodoxa* of Leo Allatius (Rome, 1652–59). His theological works were chiefly in defense of the union, the most important being "On the Union and Peace of the Old and New Churches of Rome."

(Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 96–97 (where the literature is indicated); Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, xi. 344–349, Hamburg, 1808.

JOHANNES CLIMACUS (SCHOLASTICUS, SINAITA): Monk of Mount Sinai. From the "Narratives" of Anastasius, a monk of Mount Sinai (cf. F. Nau, *Les récits inédits du moine Anastase*, Paris, 1902; and *Oriens Christianus*, ii., 1902, 58–89), it appears that Johannes Climacus died about 649. He was presumably born before 579, and became a monk in the Sinai cloister about 600, being abbot of the same before 639. If these data be correct, then this Johannes can not be identical with Johannes, the abbot of Mount Sinai to whom Gregory I. addressed a letter dated Sept. 1, 600 (Epist. xi. 1; *NPNF*, xiii. 52). Johannes was called Climacus on account of his book, "The Ladder to Paradise," so termed with reference to Jacob's ladder. In this book the spiritual conditions by which men are purified in preparation for the divine life are described in thirty steps. The process begins with renunciation of the world. The spirit turns to penance. Salutary tribulation softens the heart, and removes the dross. Presently the penitent finds words only for prayer, song, and the manifestation of love. Blessed humility leads to the imitation of Christ, and unlocks the gates of heaven. The highest estate is that of a divinely patterned apathy and rest where one beholds, in an undimmed mirror, the excellences of Paradise. However, only he who has first endured and overcome the storms of this world, will attain to that stage of blissful calm. Among the Greek monks, this tract, reinforced with notes, was for centuries in use as a guide to perfection (cf. the *Scholia* of Abbot John of Raïthu; *MPG*, lxxxviii. 1211–48).

G. Krüger.

Bibliography: The editio princeps of the "Ladder" was by M. Rader, Paris, 1633, reproduced in *MPG*, lxxxviii. 583–1248; the *Vita* by Daniel is in the latter, columns 596–608. A later edition of the work is by S. Eremites, Constantinople, 1883. A very full bibliographical apparatus is to be found in Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 143–144. Consult further: J. Fessler, *Institutiones patrologiae*, ed. B. Jungmann, ii. 890–897, Innsbruck, 1896; *DCB*, iii. 405; *KL*, vi. 1640–1641; P. Labbe in *MPG*, lxxxviii. 579–582.

JOHANNES ELEEMON: Patriarch of Alexandria; b. at Amathus (on s. shore of Cyprus); d. there probably Nov. 11, 619. He was installed as patriarch by the Emperor Heraclius, in deference to the Alexandrians, at the close of 610 or beginning of 611. His administration meant a powerful reinforcement of the orthodox cause in Alexandria. The policy of uniting the orthodox party with the Monophysites, as fomented by Heraclius and by Sergius of Constantinople, encountered in Johannes an outspoken opponent. He was famed for his great charity, whence his name, Eleemon, and his good deeds won for him the hearts of the people. When the Persians approached Alexandria in 619(?), Johannes fled to Cyprus, where he died. His anniversary day is November 12. G. Krüger.

Bibliography: The life by Leontius is in *MPG*, xciii. 1613 sqq., in Lat. transl., with notes in *MPL*, lxxiii. 337–384; the Lat. transl. of Leontius and of the life by Simeon Metaphrastes, with comment, is in *ASB*, Jan., ii. 495–535. H. Gelzer edited the life by Leontius, Freiburg, 1893. Consult: H. Gelzer, *Ein griechischer Volksschriftsteller des 7. Jahrhunderts*, Munich, 1889; F. Pösl, *Die reine . . . Liebe dargestellt in dem Leben des . . . Johannes des Almosengebers*, Regensburg, 1862; A. von Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*, ii. 471–475, Leipsic, 1890; H. T. F. Duckworth, *St. John the Almsgiver, Patriarch of Alexandria*, London, 1901; *DCB*, iii. 348.

JOHANNES PHILOPONOS: Greek philosopher, philologist, and theologian of the sixth century. Of his life few details are known, except that he was born at Alexandria and was a pupil of the Aristotelian exegete Ammonius and the grammarian Romanos. He was a man of learning, versatility, and restless energy, but, adhering fully neither to tradition nor to dogma, his fondness for a philosophical treatment of Christian dogma, to which he subscribed in general, frequently placed him in a dubious position. He won disapproval, moreover, by his interpretation of the Trinity in his "Arbitrator," a dialogue in ten books but now extant only in fragments, since he asserted that hypostasis and nature are the same, so that Christ could have but one nature, unless two hypostases were to be assumed. In the Trinity he postulated three independent hypostases comprised under a unity, which was such merely in virtue of being a generic concept. There was, therefore, no unity in the Trinity except that which presupposed the triad of hypostases and was inferred from their common predicates. The teaching here summarized brought upon Johannes the charge of tritheism, and with some show of reason, although he was not, as Leontius alleged, the founder of tritheism, but merely one of its chief representatives.

The chief work of this author still extant is his *De aeternitate mundi* (ed. V. Trincavellus, Venice, 1535), assailing Proclus, Aristotle, and Plato, and seeking to explain the creation rationally without the aid of the Bible. In his "On the Resurrection," known only from excerpts in Photius, Nicephorus, and Timotheus, he again made a concession to philosophy by his distinction between a sensuous and supersensuous creation. The second work still preserved is his *Commentariorum in Mosaicam mundi creationem libri septem* (ed. B. Corder, Vienna, 1630), based on older writers on the hexameron, especially Basil, but enriched with a mass of theories of nature and philosophy developed by the author. Mention should also be made of his *Disputatio de paschate*, printed together with the foregoing work, in defense of the thesis that on the thirteenth day of the month and on the day before the legal Passover Christ celebrated a mystic meal with his disciples, but did not actually eat a Passover-lamb.

(Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, x. 639 sqq., Hamburg, 1807; F. Trechsel, in *TSK*, viii (1835), 95–118; J. M. Schönfelder, *Die Kirchengeschichte des Johannes von Ephesus*, pp. 286–297, Munich, 1892; *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, viii (1899), 444 sqq.; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, p. 53 et passim; *KL*, vi. 1748–1754.

JOHANNES SCHOLASTICUS OF SCYTHOPOLIS: Bishop of Scythopolis. According to Photius (*Bibliotheca*, cod. xcv., p. 78, ed. Bekker, 2 vols., Berlin, 1824), a certain Johannes Scholasticus of Scythopolis wrote twelve books against the separatists of the Church; that is, the Eutychian party. Photius (cod. cvii., p. 187) doubtless correctly identified him with that Johannes Scholasticus against whom Basil the Cilician wrote an apology in the time of the Emperor Anastasius (491–518). The same author also wrote a commentary on the pseudo-Dionysian writings, about 532. According to Loofs (*Leontius of Byzantium*, pp. 269 sqq., Leipsic, 1887) he is also identical with Bishop Johannes of Scythopolis, who was in office about 540, and wrote against Severus of Antioch (cf. *Doctrina patrum*, ed. Diekamp, p. 85, Münster, 1907; and Photius cod. ccxxxi., p. 287). Possibly, too, the Johannes Scholasticus whom St. Sabas encountered at Scythopolis about 520 (Cotelerius, *Ecclesiae Graecae monumenta*, iii. 327, 4 vols., Paris, 1677–92) is the same man.

G. Krüger.

Bibliography: Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, p. 56; F. Loofs, *Leontius von Byzanz*, pp. 269–272, Leipsic, 1887; *DCB*, iii. 394, 427 (nos. 363, 565, 568).

JOHANNES SCOTUS ERIGENA. See Scotus Erigena, Johannes.

JOHANNES, ADOLF: German Roman Catholic; b. at Brendlorenzen (a village near Neustadt-an-der-Saale, 40 m. n.e. of Würzburg), Bavaria, Nov. 21, 1855. He was educated at the universities of Würzburg, Vienna, Innsbruck, and Munich, and was ordained to the priesthood in 1881. After being curate at Heidingsfeld and Hassfurt, as well as prefect of the Julianum at Würzburg, he was appointed professor in the Lyceum of Dillingen in 1886. Since 1900 he has been professor of Old-Testament exegesis, Biblical introduction, and Oriental languages. He has written *Commentar zu den Weissagungen des Propheten Obadja* (Würzburg, 1885); *Commentar zum ersten Brief des Apostels Paulus an die Thessalonicher* (Dillingen, 1898); and minor contributions.

JOHN: The name of twenty-two popes. The inconsistency in the numbers of the later ones is due to the fact that after Boniface VII. a John XV. is described in some lists as having occupied the see for four months. According to some early writers he was only elected, not consecrated, while others say that he was put forward as a candidate by the party of Boniface; but modern investigation shows that he has no claim even to the name of antipope.

John I.: Pope 523–526. He was consecrated Aug. 16 (or 13), 523. When in that year the Emperor Justin I. ordered a general persecution of heretics, the Arian Goths of the Danube province appealed for help to Theodoric, who conceived the idea of sending to Justin an embassy of prominent Romans, and John was forced to take part in it. Arriving in Constantinople at the end of 525, he achieved the purpose of his mission, but was thrown into prison on his return by Theodoric, who apparently considered him a supporter of the Byzantine party, and died there May 18, 526.

(H. Boehmer.)

Bibliography: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Mommsen, in *MGH; Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 133–137; T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, iii. 510–520, Oxford, 1885; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, i. 322, 328–329, London, 1894; G. Pfeilschifter, in *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien*, iii. 155–202, Münster, 1896; H. Grisar, *Geschichte Roms und der Päpste*, i. 481–493, Freiburg, 1898; Bower, *Popes*, i. 324–327; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 440–442; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 120–122, London, n.d.; *DCB*, iii. 389–390.

John II.: Pope 533–535. He was elected by the influence of the Ostrogothic court, and consecrated Jan. 2, 533. The most important event of his pontificate was the settlement of the Theopaschite controversy (see Theopaschites). On June 6, 533, the Emperor Justinian laid before him a confession containing the disputed formula for confirmation. He hesitated a long time, but finally, on Mar. 24, 534, issued an approving document which, with the emperor's letter, was included in the Code of Justinian. He deposed the adulterous Bishop Contumeliosus of Riez, and named Cæsarius of Arles administrator of the diocese—the first act of jurisdiction of this kind recorded of a pope.

(H. Boehmer.)

Bibliography: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 285–286, Paris, 1886, ed. Mommsen, in *MGH*, *Gest. pont. Rom.*,

i (1898), 141; Cassiodorus, *Variae*, ed. Mommsen, in *MGH, Auct. Ant.*, xii (1894), 279 sqq., 331–332, and pp. xxix.–xxx.; T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders*, iv. 87 sqq., Oxford, 1885; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, ii. 313–324, Bonn, 1885; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, ii. 194–196, London, 1894; H. Grisar, *Geschichte Roms und der Päpste*, i. 497–498, Freiburg, 1898; Bower, *Popes*, i. 333–336; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 458; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 124–125, London, n.d.

John III.: Pope 561–574. He was the son of Anastasius, a prominent Roman, and was elected after a long interregnum July 17, 561. He succeeded in bringing about the return to the Roman obedience of the revolting provinces of Italy. Ravenna submitted Sept. 15, 568, and in 571 Archbishop Laurence II. of Milan entered into negotiations with Rome. His influence was also felt in the Frankish kingdom in the restoration of the deposed bishops of Embrun and Gap, who had appealed to him. (H. Boehmer.)

Bibliography: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 305–306, Paris, 1886, ed. Mommsen, in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 157–158; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 136–137; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, ii. 401–403, Bonn, 1885; T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, v. 65, Oxford, 1895; *DCB*, iii. 891; Bower, *Popes*, i. 374–380; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 475; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 132–134, London, n.d.

John IV.: Pope 640–642. The son of Venantius, a Dalmatian teacher, he was elected Aug. 2, 640, and consecrated September 22. Soon after he held a synod at which he condemned Monothelitism; and when Pyrrhus, patriarch of Constantinople, defended this heresy by appealing to the decisions of Honorius, John addressed a strong letter to the sons of the Emperor Heraclius in which he asserted the complete orthodoxy of Honorius and demanded the condemnation of Pyrrhus' teaching. He died Oct. 12, 642. (H. Boehmer.)

Bibliography: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 330, Paris, 1886, ed. Mommsen, in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 177; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 227–228; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, ii. 517–520, Bonn, 1885; R. Baxmann, *Die Politik der Päpste*, i. 171 sqq., Elberfeld, 1868; T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vi. 18, 172, Oxford, 1895; Mann, *Popes*, i. 351, 354, 367; Bower, *Popes*, i. 438–441; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, ii. 272; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 150–152, London, n.d.; *DCB*, iii. 391–392.

John V.: Pope 685–686. He was a Syrian by birth, who, in accordance with the constitution of Constantine VI., was consecrated immediately after his election (July 23, 685) without waiting for imperial confirmation. His only known official act was the bringing of the Sardinian church once more into subjection to Rome. He died Aug. 2, 686. (H. Boehmer.)

Bibliography: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 366–367, Paris, 1886, ed. Mommsen, in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 205–206; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 242; Mann, *Popes*, i., 2, pp. 64–67; Bower, *Popes*, i. 489–490; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, ii. 287; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 166–167, London, n.d.; *DCB*, iii. 392.

John VI.: Pope 701–705. A Greek by birth, he was consecrated October 30. The Emperor Apsimar-Tiberius, disapproving his election, sent the exarch Theophylact to Rome to procure his deposition; but the military force of all Italy is said to have assembled around Rome in his defense. He was in greater danger from the Lombard Duke Gisulf of Benevento, but by means of gifts warded off this attack also. He died Jan. 11, 705. (H. Boehmer.)

Bibliography: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 383, Paris, 1886, ed. Mommsen, in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 217–218; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 242; Mann, *Popes*, i. 2, pp. 105–108; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 9–12; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 172–173, London, n.d.; *DCB*, iii. 392–393.

John VII.: Pope 705–707. He was a Greek, renowned, according to the *Liber pontificalis*, for his eloquence, education, and taste for art. He showed little firmness in his dealings with Justinian II. in regard to the confirmation of the Quinisext Council. He maintained friendly relations with the Lombards. (H. Boehmer.)

Bibliography: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 384, Paris, 1896, ed. Mommsen, in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 219–220; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 246–247; Mann, *Popes*, i. 2, pp. 109–123; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, ii. 595–596, Bonn, 1885; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, ii. 194–196, London, 1894; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 12–13; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 173–175, London, n.d.; *DCB*, iii. 393.

John VIII.: Pope 872–882. He was a Roman by birth. On being elected pope Dec. 14, 872, he took up with alacrity the task of ruling in the spirit of Nicholas I. He had many qualities necessary for success, including a genius for financial and military organization and for promptly turning to advantage each change in the political situation. His whole force was devoted to two purely political aims, the liberation of Italy from the Saracens and its subjection, together with that of the empire, to the over-lordship of the papacy. The first, a necessary preliminary to the second, he pursued in alliance with the Emperor Louis II., but on his own account he built a fleet, organized a standing militia and completed the fortification of Rome. The greatest obstacle to the success of his plans was the impossibility of detaching the princes of Palermo, Naples, and Capua, and the maritime power of Amalfi, from their alliance with the Saracens, to whom he was himself forced toward the end of his reign to pay a yearly tribute. His natural unfriendliness to the Germans and the Carolingian dynasty showed itself on the death of Louis (Oct. 12, 875), when he invited not Louis the German but Charles the Bald to Rome to receive the imperial crown, which he placed on his head at Christmas. When Charles the Bald died in the next year, John had to reckon with the claims to the empire of his nephew Carloman, whose adherents appeared in Rome in the spring of 878, imprisoned John, and took an oath of the leading citizens to support Carloman as emperor. As soon as the pope was released, he went by sea to France and held a council at Troyes, where he crowned Louis the Stammerer (Sept. 7, 878); but as Louis showed little inclination to be mixed up in the Italian troubles, John had another candidate, Count Boso of Provence, who followed him back to Italy and was to have been crowned king in Rome. The plan failed because the German Carolingians had gained too much ground in northern Italy. In August, 879, John was forced to acknowledge Charles the Fat at Ravenna as king of Italy, and some time before Feb. 9, 881, to crown him as emperor, and thus bid farewell to any hope of realizing his Italian plans. In the controversy between Methodius and the Bavarian episcopate, he took the side of the former, although in 879 he summoned him to Rome to answer a charge of heresy. But John's attempts to please both parties sowed the seeds of future discord in the young Moravian church. He carried on his predecessors' policy more consistently in the Bulgarian question, but gained nothing except vague promises, while the Greek clergy and liturgy remained in possession. This question had troubled the relations of Rome with Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople. After his death in 877, Photius (who had been deposed by the fourth council of Constantinople in 869) was reinstated. In 879, in order to win the Emperor Basil's support against the Saracens, John expressed his readiness to recognize him on certain conditions, and though Photius grossly falsified the terms when he recited them in the council of 879, John disavowed the action of his protesting legates and still sought for union. The assertion of later historians that he reversed this policy before his death (Dec. 15, 882) and once more deposed Photius finds no support in his letters. (H. BOEHMER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The letters of this pope may be found in Mansi, *Concilia*, xvii. 1 sqq.; S. Löwenfeld, *Epistolae Romanorum pontificum ineditae*, pp. 24–34, Leipsic, 1885; and Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 376–422. Consult: Hincmar, *Annales*, ed. G. H. Pertz, in *MGH*, *Script.*, i (1826), 495 sqq.; *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii. 121–122, Paris, 1892; Mann, *Popes*, iii. 231–353; J. Hergenröther, *Photius*, 3 vols., Regensburg, 1867–69; B. Jungmann, *Dissertationes selectae*, iii. 419–435, Regensburg, 1882; A. Gasquet, *L'Empire byzantin et la monarchie franque*, pp. 432–482, Paris, 1888; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, iii. 170–275, Bonn, 1892; A. Lapôtre, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège à l'époque carolingienne*, vol. i., Paris, 1895 (Ultramontane); F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iii. 171–203, London, 1895; Hauck, *KD*, ii. 558 sqq., 702 sqq.; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iv. 447 sqq., 514 sqq.; Bower, *Popes*, 283–292; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 37, 81–100; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 232–233, London, n.d.

John IX.: Pope 898–900. He was a Benedictine, and was elevated to the papacy after the expulsion of Sergius III. At a synod in St. Peter's he reversed the proceedings of the synod of Stephen VI. (q.v.) which had condemned Formosus (q.v.), and reaffirmed the validity of the orders conferred by the latter. He revised the provisions for papal elections, recognized Lambert of Spoleto as emperor, and declared the coronation of Arnulf null and void. At first he confirmed the decrees of his predecessors in regard to Photius, but just before his death he seems to have succeeded in reaching some understanding with the Greeks at a synod. (H. BOEHMER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii. 232, Paris, 1892; J. M. Watterich, *Romanorum pontificum vitae*, i. 656 sqq., Leipsic, 1862; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 442–443; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, iii. 307–311, Bonn, 1892; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iii. 231–238, London, 1895; Mann, *Popes*, iii. 245, 370, 384, 394; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 302–304; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 112; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 240–241, London, n.d.

John X.: Pope 914–928. He is said to have been born at Toffignano in Romagna, to have been first a deacon in Bologna, and then to have risen to the bishopric of that see, which he immediately exchanged in some uncanonical manner for that of Ravenna, whence he was called, again uncanonically, by the *primates* of Rome—meaning notably Theodora, to whom he seems to have been related—to the papacy about March, 914. He displayed some zeal and ability in ecclesiastical affairs, maintaining close relations with Germany and France; the instructions sent to the archbishop of Reims for dealing with the newly converted Normans are notable. He was, however, more important as a politician and military commander, succeeding in uniting the principal Italian princes and the eastern emperor against the Saracens, and personally winning a brilliant victory over them on the lower Garigliano in August, 916. But the league soon fell a prey to the spirit of faction, the Emperor Berengar was murdered at Ravenna in 924, and John had a powerful foe in Rome in the person of the intriguing Marozia. In June, 928, his brother Peter, prefect of the city, was murdered and he himself was thrown into prison, where he soon died. (H. BOEHMER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: Liudprand, *Antapodosis*, ed. E. Dümmler, pp. 44–47, 61, 73, Hanover, 1877; Benedictus, *Chronicon*, ed. G. Waitz, in *MGH*, *Script.* xiii (1881), 714–715. Consult further: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii. 240–241, Paris, 1892; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 447–453; J. M. Watterich, *Romanorum pontificum vitae*, i. 35–36, 661 sqq., Leipsic, 1862; B. Jungmann, *Dissertationes selectae*, iv. 46–62, Regensburg, 1884; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, iii. 319–328; Bonn, 1892; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iii. 249–279, London, 1895; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 308–311; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 160–166; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 245–247, London, n.d.

John XI.: Pope 931–936. A natural son of Sergius III. by Marozia, he was elevated to the papacy about 931 by his mother's influence, and was involved in her fall when his half-brother Alberic gained power a year later. It is not known whether he ever regained his freedom, but it was undoubtedly Alberic who decided all the more important acts of jurisdiction. John died in January, 936. (H. BOEHMER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii. 243, Paris, 1892; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 454–455; J. M. Watterich, *Romanorum pontificum vitae*, i. 38, 669 sqq., Leipsic, 1862; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, iii. 329–331, Bonn, 1892; Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iii. 283–305, London, 1895; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 311–312; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 248–249, London, n.d.

John XII. (Octavian): Pope 955–964. He was the illegitimate son of Alberic, and was elected Dec. 16, 955. The most shocking moral scandals were rife; but with all his vices he combined the soaring ambition of his house. First he tried to extend his power in the south, and then to deal with King Berengar, both without success. Berengar's son Adalbert was occupying Roman territory when John decided to appeal to Otto I., possibly under pressure from the reforming party among the Roman clergy. After exacting guaranties for his own position, he admitted Otto into the city and crowned him emperor (Feb. 2, 962); but hardly had Otto left Rome when John entered into relations with Adalbert and attempted to do so with the Byzantine empire. Becoming aware of his treachery, Otto marched back to Rome. John and Adalbert fled to Tivoli. A synod met in St. Peter's under the emperor's presidency, which after nearly a month's debate declared John guilty of perjury, murder, sacrilege, and incest, deposed him, and elected the *protoscriniarius* Leo, who was then only a layman, in his place. After the emperor had left Rome, John's friends rose and expelled Leo. John returned to the Lateran, and held a council of his own (Feb. 26) at which he annulled the acts of the previous one and declared Leo deposed. Stern vengeance was taken upon the reforming leaders, but before Otto could return John was struck down either by a stroke of apoplexy or by an injured husband, and died May 14, 964. (H. Boehmer.)

Bibliography: The *Epistolae et privilegia* are in *MPL*, cxxxiii. Sources are: Liudprand, *De rebus gestis Ottonis*, ed. E. Dümmler, pp. 124–136, Hanover, 1877; *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii. 246 sqq., Paris, 1892. Consult further: Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 463–467; J. M. Watterich, *Romanorum pontificum vitae*, i. 41–63; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iii. 328–351, London, 1895; B. Jungmann, *Dissertationes selectae*, iv. 449 sqq., Regensburg, 1884; Hauck, *KD*, ii. 222–236; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 315–319; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 175–184; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 252–254, London, n.d.

John XIII.: Pope 965–972. Formerly bishop of Narni, and apparently a son of the younger Theodora, he was elected under the influence of Otto I. and consecrated Oct. 1. In December the citizens rose and imprisoned him. He escaped, but was unable to reenter Rome except with the help of the emperor, to whom he remained in absolute subjection. This relation, however, increased his consideration in the West, and from countries as distant as Spain, England, and Scotland questions were referred to him for decision. He died Sept. 6, 972. (H. Boehmer.)

Bibliography: The *Epistolae et privilegia* are in *MPL*, cxxxv. Consult: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii. 252, Paris, 1892; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 470–477; J. M. Watterich, *Romanorum pontificum vitae*, i. 44, 66, 685–686, Leipsic, 1862; B. Jungmann, *Dissertationes selectae*, iv. 493 sqq., Regensburg, 1884; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, iii. 354–363, Bonn, 1892; Hauck, *KD*, iii. passim; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iii. 357–377, London, 1895; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 321–323; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 255–256, London, n.d.

John XIV.: Pope 983–984. Formerly known as Peter, bishop of Pavia and chancellor of Italy, he was elected in Nov. 983, by the influence of Otto II. After Otto's death the rival claimant, Boniface VII., returned from Constantinople and imprisoned John in the Castle of Sant'Angelo, where he died Aug. 20, 984. (H. Boehmer.)

Bibliography: Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 484; J. M. Watterich, *Romanorum pontificum vitae*, i. 66, 686–687, Leipsic, 1862; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 325; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 260, London, n.d.; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iii. 393, 397, London, 1895.

John XV.: Pope 985–986. During his pontificate the political power in Rome was in the hands of John Crescentius II., and the papacy enjoyed little consideration abroad, as is shown by the history of the Reims contest (see Sylvester II.). His relations with Germany, however, were relatively close, and he acted (through his legate Leo of Trevi) as mediator between Ethelred of England and Richard of Normandy, sanctioning the peace of Rouen (Mar. 1, 991). He died early in April, 996. (H. Boehmer.)

Bibliography: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii. 260, Paris, 1892; J. M. Watterich, *Romanorum pontificum vitae*, i. 66–67, 687–688, Leipsic, 1862; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, iii. 369–380, Bonn, 1892; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iii. 398–408, London, 1895; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 326–329.

John XVI.: Pope 997–998. A Greek of low extraction from Rossano in Calabria, he was made abbot of Nonantula by the favor of the Empress Theophanu, who, as regent after Otto II.'s death, procured his elevation to the bishopric of Piacenza. When John Crescentius expelled Gregory V. from Rome, he assumed the papacy; but Otto III. restored Gregory, and John was captured in March, 998, deposed, mutilated, and imprisoned in a Roman monastery, where he lived apparently until April 2, 1013. (H. Boehmer.)

Bibliography: Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 495–496; J. M. Watterich, *Romanorum pontificum vitae*, i. 68, 689 sqq., Leipsic, 1862; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, iii. 385–387, Bonn, 1892; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iii. 422–427, London, 1895; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 330; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 263–264, London, n.d.

John XVII.: Pope 1003. He was a Roman named Sicco, who was elected June 13 by the will of Crescentius, and died Dec. 7. The only thing known of him is that he was married before his elevation. (H. Boehmer.)

Bibliography: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii. 265, Paris, 1892; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 501; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 333; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 265.

John XVIII.: Pope 1003–09. He was another creature of Crescentius, named Fasanus or Phasianus, son of a Roman presbyter Leo. That he was not lacking in energy is shown by his vigorous proceedings against the bishops of Sens and Orléans, who had required Abbot Gauzlin of Fleury to burn the papal privileges of exemption; and he seems to have had some success against his Byzantine opponents. He died in June, 1009. (H. Boehmer.)

Bibliography: *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii. 266, Paris, 1892; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 501–503; J. M. Watterich, *Romanorum pontificum vitae*, i. 69, 699–700, Leipsic, 1862; Mary Bateson, in *Historical Review*, 1895, pp. 728–729; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iv. 7–10, London, 1896; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 334; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 266, London, n.d.

John XIX.: Pope 1024–32. He was the brother of Benedict VIII., Romanus by name, and was elected by the Tusculan party between April 12 and May 10. The eastern Emperor Basil II. requested him to acknowledge the patriarch Eustathius of Constantinople as "ecumenical bishop," or practically as an eastern pope. John was disposed to accede, but the monastic reformers raised such a storm of protest that the negotiations were broken off. After crowning Conrad II. (Mar. 26, 1027), John was completely under his power, and his decrees were treated with contempt by the emperor in Germany. In France, however, his authority seems to have been respected, and King Canute of England paid him a visit in 1027. Apparently without much protest, he conducted a simoniacal traffic; the only objection raised by Canute to the demand of money for conferring the pallium was to the largeness of the amount. He seems to have died Nov. 6, 1032. (H. Boehmer.)

Bibliography: Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 514–519; J. M. Watterich, *Romanorum pontificum vitae*, i. 70, 708–711, Leipsic, 1862; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, iii. 418–428,

Bonn, 1892; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iv. 31–39, London, 1896; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 337–339; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, i. 269–270, London, n.d.; Hauck, *KD*, iii. 496, 555–556, 559, 561.

John XXI. (Pedro Juliani): Pope 1276–77. A native of Lisbon, he became cardinal-bishop of Tusculum in 1273, and was elected pope at Viterbo Sept. 15 or 16, 1276, taking the title of John XXI., though he was in reality the twentieth pope of this name. He was a man of great learning, though apparently of equal eccentricity; since the fourteenth century it has been usually believed that he was identical with "Petrus Hispanus," the author of a number of medical works and a popular compendium of logic. His pontificate was without influence on the development of the church. He was injured by the fall of a ceiling in the papal palace at Viterbo, and died May 20, 1277. (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: J. Giurand and E. Cadier, *Les Registres de Gregoire X. et Jean XXI.*, Paris, 1898; R. Stapfer, *Papst Johannes XXI.*, Münster, 1898; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 25–26; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, v. 475–477, London, 1897; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, ii. 106–108, ib. n.d.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vi. 134–135.

John XXII. (Jacques Dueza): Pope 1316–34. He was born at Cahors, France, about 1244, became bishop of Avignon in 1310 and cardinal-bishop of Porto in 1312, and was elected pope at Lyons, after an interregnum of more than two years, on Aug. 7, 1316, taking up his residence at Avignon. The main object of his policy was to get rid of the remains of imperial power in Italy, in the interests of the papacy. He took advantage of the contested election to the empire in 1314 to declare on Mar. 31, 1317, that upon a vacancy in the imperial office its *jurisdictio, regimen, et dispositio* passed to the pope; and on this ground he forbade the imperial vicars and other officials named by Henry VII. to retain their offices, himself appointing Robert of Naples, as his predecessor had done, imperial vicar for Italy. He maintained a more or less neutral position between the rival claimants in Germany. The case was altered when Louis the Bavarian's victory over his competitor at the battle of Mühldorf (Sept. 18, 1322) made it possible for him to take hold of Italian affairs, and his nomination of Berthold of Neiffen as imperial vicar showed that he was disposed to do so. In a public consistory (Oct. 8, 1323) he brought charges against Louis (the so-called "first process"), his action being based on the claim first made by Gregory VII. and renewed by Innocent III. that to the pope belonged the right of examining and approving or rejecting the candidate elected to the imperial throne. Louis was accused of disregarding papal rights by taking the title of emperor without confirmation and assuming to administer the empire before he had received it, as well as of favoring and protecting the Visconti, who had been condemned for heresy. He was summoned, on pain of excommunication, to lay down the reins of government and annul his previous acts, and his subjects were released from their allegiance. John probably did not expect Louis to yield obedience; what he hoped to gain was a renewal of the conflict in Germany. After a momentary hesitation (second process, Jan. 7, 1324), the sentence of excommunication was pronounced against Louis Mar. 23, and a like penalty threatened against all who should continue to render obedience to him (third process). On July 11 he was declared deprived of all rights supposed to follow from his election, and once more summoned to answer at the bar of Rome before Oct. 1, while his adherents were excommunicated (fourth process).

In reply to the first process, Louis had made a declaration which asserted the validity of an election independent of papal confirmation, raised the charge of heresy against John himself, and appealed to a general council. This declaration appears not to have been published; but on May 22, 1324, he came out publicly with a renewed appeal to a council. The attempt to set up a rival emperor failed, and the menace of excommunication and interdict had but little effect in Germany. Early in 1327 Louis came down to Italy with unexpected success, had himself crowned in Rome (Jan. 17, 1328) by four syndics elected by the people, and brought about the election (May 12) of an antipope, known as Nicholas V. John met these proceedings by declaring that Louis had forfeited all fiefs which he held from either Church or empire, especially the duchy of Bavaria (fifth process, Apr. 3, 1327); by condemning him as a heretic (Oct. 23); by proclaiming a crusader's indulgence for all who should bear arms against him for a year (Jan. 21, 1328); and by ordering a new election to the empire later in the spring. Louis was not strong enough to keep the control of Italy, and was obliged to leave it in the winter of 1329–30, after which his antipope made his submission. In a sermon on All Saints' Day, 1331, the pope declared that the beatific vision of God was not granted to the saints until after the resurrection. Doubts had already been expressed as to his orthodoxy, and this statement gave fresh offense, all the more that the Italian cardinals were unfriendly to the Gascon pope. Taking advantage of this situation Louis, in concert with Cardinal Napoleone Orsini, addressed a formal request to the sacred college in 1334 for the summoning of a general council; but before any result could follow this new attack, John died on December 3 of that year.

John is described as a small, thin, ugly, bald-headed man. He was incessantly busy without accomplishing anything worth while. Germany was injured, Italy distracted, and the Church and papacy lowered in the general esteem by his pontificate, which earned a bad name also by the financial methods developed by him. He needed money to enrich his relatives, and he delighted in amassing it for its own sake. Giovanni Villani estimated his fortune to be 25,000,000 florins (over $6,000,000); but about 800,000 florins is probably much nearer the mark. As a means of money-getting he made wide use of reservations (see Reservations, Papal). Immediately after his election he reserved all benefices whose previous holders had received another position from the pope, and a year later, by declaring that no one might hold more than two benefices, he created a large number of other vacancies, which he likewise reserved to himself. In 1322 he reserved all the benefices in the patriarchate of Aquileia and the archbishoprics of Ravenna, Milan, and Genoa. The same purpose was served by the foundation of a large number of new dioceses by division of the older ones. For John's relation to the Franciscans, see FRANCIS, SAINT, OF ASSISI, III., §§ 5–7; for his activity in the field of canon law, see CANON LAW, II., 6, § 3. See also BEGHARDS, BEGUINES, § 6. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The weightiest documents of John's reign are published in the *Annales ecclesiastici* of O. Raynaldus ed. A. Theiner, vol. xxiv., Bar le Duc, 1872; in *AMA*, xv. 2, 61 sqq., xvi. 2, 156 sqq., xvii. 1, 159 sqq., 1880–86; in *Vatikanische Studien*, Innsbruck, 1890; W. H. Bliss, *Calendar . . . Papal Letters*, ii. 123 sqq., in *Rolls Series*, London, 1895; the bull *Licet juxta doctrinam* is quoted in Mirbt, *Quellen*, pp. 152–153; important also are *Lettres du pape Jean XXII., 1316–34, relatives à la France*, Athens, 1900 sqq. The earlier lives are collected in S. Baluze, *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, i. 113 sqq., Paris, 1693, and in G. Villani, *Cronica*, books ix.–xi., Florence, 1823. Consult: Pastor, *Popes*, i. 58–83; C. Müller, *Der Kampf Ludwigs . . . mit der römischen Kurie*, vol. i., Tübingen, 1879; S. Riezler, *Geschichte Baierns*, ii. 348 sqq., Gotha, 1880; W. Felten, *Die Bulle Ne pretereat*, 2 vols., Treves, 1885–87; B. Jungmann, *Dissertationes selectae*, vi. 156 sqq., Regensburg, 1886; M. Faucon, *La Librairie des papes d'Avignon*, 2 vols., Paris, 1886–87; *Regulae cancellariae apostolicae*, Innsbruck, 1888; L. König, *Die päpstliche Kammer unter . . . Johann XXII.*, Vienna, 1894; Neander, *Christian Church*, iv. 358 et passim; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vi. 575 sqq.; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 73–78; B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes*, ii. 140–147, London, n.d.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vii. 18–120.

John XXIII. (Baltasare Cossa): Pope 1410–15. He came of a noble Neapolitan family. At first he took up the profession of arms, but later he studied at the University of Bologna and became cardinal in 1402 and legate of Bologna in 1403. In this position he rendered distinguished services for the restitution and protection of the Papal States (q.v.) and for the increase of the papal finances. He fell out with Gregory XII. and became the leading spirit of the Council of Pisa (q.v.); the newly elected pope, Alexander V., was only an instrument in his hands. After the death of Alexander, John himself was elected pope May 17, 1410. He carried on a successful war against Ladislaus of Naples (battle of Roccasicca, Apr. 29, 1411), but was forced to flee and throw himself into the arms of the Roman King Siegmund. By his ignominious flight from the Council of Constance (Mar. 20 to 21, 1415), John incurred the hatred of the whole assembly. On May 29, 1415, the council deposed him and delivered him into the hands of Count Palatine Louis of Bavaria. He was then imprisoned in Radolfszell, Gottlieben, Heidelberg, and Mannheim till 1418, when he was released by Martin V. and made cardinal bishop of Tusculum. He died Dec. 22, 1419. (B. BESS.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Pastor, *Popes*, i. 191–199; Creighton, *Papacy*, i. 267–344; C. Hunger, *Zur Geschichte Papst Johannes XXIII.*, Bonn, 1876; J. Schwerdfeger, *Papst Johann XXIII. und die Wahl Siegmunds, 1410*, Vienna, 1895; H. Blumenthal, in *ZKG*, xxi. 1900; Neander, *Christian Church*, v. 90 sqq.; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 171–201; E. J. Kitts, *In the Days of the Councils; a Sketch of the Life and Times of Baldassare Cossa*, Edinburgh, 1909.

JOHN THE APOSTLE.

I. The Man.
  His Position Among the Apostles (§ 1).
  His Family (§ 2).
  His Character (§ 3).
II. The Writings Attributed to John.
1. The Apocalypse.
  Preliminary Considerations (§ 1).
  External Testimony (§ 2).
  John the Presbyter (§ 3).
  The Date of Composition (§ 4).
2. The Epistles.
  I John (§ 1).
  II and III John (§ 2).
3. The Gospel.
  Its Character (§ 1).
  Internal Testimony to Authorship (§ 2).
  Objections to Johannine Authorship (§ 3).
  John's Residence at Ephesus (§ 4).
  Conclusion (§ 5).

I. The Man: The picture which the name of John calls up in the mind of every educated Christian is a reflection of the traits apparent in the writings transmitted under his name; but whether he was the author of those writings has been for a hundred years a question to which diverse answers have been given, many denying his authorship absolutely, while others regard it as uncertain. The attempt must be made to arrive at the historical position of the apostle from these writings and from the traditions as to his later life which are so closely connected with them.

1. His Position Among the Apostles. In nearly all the lists of the apostles, after the names of Peter and Andrew come those of James and John, the sons of Zebedee. That in Acts i. 13 John comes before James, and both before Andrew may be explained by the fact that in this book John was to be frequently named as a prominent man in the apostolic circle, while James appears only once, in the mention of his martyrdom (xii. 2). On the other hand, it may be concluded from the almost constant precedence given to James in the Gospels that he was the elder brother, for the greater historical importance of John was well known by the time the Gospels were written. According to an old and wide-spread tradition, John was the youngest of all the apostles. If this is accepted, it adds to the probability of the assertion that he died a very old man after the accession of Trajan, 98 A.D.

2. His Family. The father of James and John pursued with them and with several hired men (Mark i. 20) the trade of a fisherman at Capernaum. More is known of the mother; she accompanied Christ on his last journey to Jerusalem, and by her request for places of honor in the Messianic kingdom for her sons showed not only her own ambition but her firm belief in the coming of that kingdom; she was seen again at the cross, and appears as one of the women who had helped to support the Savior in Galilee and on this last journey, and cared for the proper burial of his body after the crucifixion. Her name, Salome, is preserved by Mark (xv. 40, xvi. 1; cf. Matt. xxvii. 56). The comparison of John xix. 25 with this last passage and Mark xv. 40 leads to a tempting hypothesis that she was the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus, which would tend to explain more than one traditional statement about the boldness of her demand for her sons. Their call, as well as that of Peter and Andrew, is placed by the Evangelists among the first acts of the ministry of Jesus in Galilee after the imprisonment of John the Baptist, whose disciples they had apparently been, therefore being fully acquainted with the personality and teaching of Jesus.

3. His Character.

With Peter the two brothers formed the inner circle of his associates, whom he took with him to the house of Jaïrus, to the mount of the transfiguration, and to Gethsemane. A comparison of Mark x. 35 with Matt. xx. 20 shows that they shared their mother's ambitions for their future; though it must not be forgotten that in reply to the searching question of Jesus, they declared their readiness to go through all the trials and sufferings which must precede his glorification. It is they, with Peter, who come to the mind in reading of strife as to precedence among the apostles (Matt. xviii. 1; Mark ix. 33; Luke xxii. 24). In connection with one of the admonitions of Jesus on these occasions occurs the account of John's complaint of the man who worked wonders in his name without being his avowed disciple (Luke ix. 49). It was not their own honor, however, that they wished to see avenged by a divine judgment upon the Samaritan village in the following passage (ib. verses 51–56). It can scarcely be doubted that it was such expressions of an unchastened spirit that caused Christ to give them the name of Boanerges (Mark iii. 17). That both the brothers afterward learned to master their impetuous wrath and their jealous ambition is amply attested. A story of James preserved by Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, II., ix. 2, 3) gives a touching evidence of it; and the whole history of John speaks for it, though his natural disposition appears not extirpated but purified and regulated in the words and actions of his old age. It must have been his natural gifts and fiery zeal which procured for him, even in the lifetime of his elder brother, so commanding a position among the apostles and in the church of Palestine (Acts iii. 1–11, iv. 13, 19, viii. 14). In Acts xv., indeed, he does not appear so prominently as Peter and James in the discussions of the council at Jerusalem; but Paul names him with them as a pillar of the Church (Gal. ii. 9). Paul refutes the assertions of his Galatian opponents by facts which he could not have invented and would not have adduced if they were not demonstrable; all that those assertions prove is that John, like Peter and James, continued to live, with the churches immediately subject to their guidance in Palestine, according to the forms of the Jewish law, while they solemnly declared themselves satisfied with the missionary vocation of Paul and the independence of his non-Jewish converts. The position of John in regard to these burning questions of the middle of the first century is the last historical notice of him in the New Testament, outside of the Johannine writings themselves.

II. The Writings Attributed to John: The works to be discussed under this heading are five books of the New Testament, viz., the Fourth Gospel, three Epistles, and the Book of Revelation or Apocalypse.

1. Preliminary Considerations.

1. The Apocalypse: This comes first in order because it is the only one which bears John's name upon its face. If the author of such a pastoral letter to the seven churches of Asia did not think it necessary to identify himself any further than by the bare mention of his name and his designation as a servant of God, it follows that his personality must have been well known to all these churches, somewhat widely scattered throughout Asia Minor, and that at the time of its composition there was no other John in those parts with whom he could be confused. It follows, again, from the addresses to the individual churches that the writer was as well acquainted with the circumstances of these churches as the churches were with him. A third fact to be borne in mind is that the book was not only destined originally to be read in their gatherings, but that in these very churches it was actually received from the beginning of the second century as a divine revelation.

2. External Testimony.

Papias, bishop of Hierapolis near Laodicea, attests its credibility about 125; Justin includes in his "Dialogue with Trypho" (written about 155 A.D.) a report of a discussion held at Ephesus to prove that the gift of prophecy had passed over from the synagogue to the Church; the "presbyters in Asia," whom Irenaeus reveres as disciples of John, taught by his own lips, occupied themselves with a discussion of the number of the beast (Rev. xiii. 18); the "Acts of John," composed in the same province hardly later than 160–170 by one "Leucius" of the school of Valentinus, attributes the order of the seven churches to the successive migrations of the apostle. About the same time the Alogi (q.v.), who, in their opposition to Montanism, wished to see all prophecy, and thus the Apocalypse with the other Johannine writings, banished from the Church, could press this demand only by the assertion that the heretic Cerinthus, John's contemporary at Ephesus, had foisted the Apocalypse on the Church under John's name. Baur and his school held to Johannine authorship, and, in fact, considered the Apocalypse the only authentic work of the apostle.

3. John the Presbyter.

Those who could not accept the book as written by the brother of James, and yet shrank from the pseudonymous theory, at least in the startling form in which it was held by the Alogi and Caius of Rome, cast about to find another John who would serve the purpose. Thus Dionysius of Alexandria (c. 260) attempted to support the possibility of there having been such a man, at the time and place, by the fact of the existence of a twofold tradition as to the burial-place of John at Ephesus. Eusebius followed him, and discovered the other John in the prologue of Papias (*Hist. eccl.*, III., xxxix. 5, 6), calling him "John the Presbyter." This view has been taken by Lücke, Bleek, Ewald, and others in modern times; and recently a strong tendency has shown itself to make this "John the Presbyter" responsible for all that bears the name of John (Meyer-Bousset, Harnack). Even John Mark, who was set aside by Dionysius as out of the question, has been taken up by Hitzig as the author of the whole Apocalypse, and by Spitta as the author of what he considers the original nucleus (i. 4–vii. 17, xxii. 8–21).

4. The Date of Composition.

Space forbids going into the long history of the hypotheses which have been set forth as to the growth of the book, which is frequently held to have been a lengthy process. The following conclusions, however, seem safe. The assertion of Irenaeus (*Haer.*, V., xxx. 3) that the visions were seen and the book written toward the end of the reign of Domitian, or about 95, finds support in the numerous historical data of the opening chapters. The designed and immediately accomplished introduction of the book into public liturgical use precludes the possibility of any notable alterations in it between 100 and 150. The author, as his name and idiom show, is of Hebrew birth, and about 95 had a recognized position of authority over the church of the province, without having any contemporary rival of the same name. He is the only John of Ephesus of whom anything is known from a tradition reaching back into his lifetime and in decisive points independent of his own writings. That he does not call himself an apostle is no proof that he was not one; his apostleship had no immediate connection with his apocalyptic purpose, and he does not describe himself at all.

2. The Epistles:

1. I John.

Of the Epistles, the first, which Papias cites and Polycarp obviously imitates, is not in form a letter. Not only is the introduction (i. 1–4) unlike the ordinary beginning of a letter, but it lacks at its close, too, what would be expected. There is almost no allusion to any local conditions of the readers. From v. 21 it may be inferred that the readers lived amid pagan surroundings; the repeated " I write unto you " shows that it was not a homily delivered before an assembled community, but rather a treatise addressed from a distance to a number of local churches of non-Jewish origin. The tone is that of an aged man who enjoyed high consideration as a teacher, and who spoke not only in his own name but in that of others who have likewise seen and heard Christ on earth, and stood as witnesses to a great fact (i. 1 sqq., iv. 14). A personal follower of Christ (named John, according to all tradition except that of the Alogi), who, with his colleagues of similar qualifications, had been occupied in other fields, in his old age addressed himself to some communities of Gentile converts as a teacher possessing great authority, presumably superior to that of others laboring among them. History knows of no one who fulfils all these conditions except the John who at the end of the first century ruled the Church of Asia Minor from Ephesus. That the writer was an apostle, as in the second century not only his disciples but (in their way) his opponents admitted, is rendered extremely probable by the strong expressions of the opening verses.

2. II and III John.

The second and third Epistles are intimately connected with the first by their language and line of thought, by the combating of the same errors (I John ii. 18–26, iv. 1–3, v. 5–12; II John 7–11), and by the position of the writer, which stands out even more clearly from them than it does from the first Epistle and the Apocalypse. That this position was not unquestioned appears from I John iv. 6; and in II John 8–11 the author charges the churches to have nothing to do with those who refused to receive his teaching. From III John 9, 10 it appears that a leader of the Church has not only employed " malicious words " against John but has renounced communion with John's associates and attempted to cut off those who received them. Asserting his authority, John writes not to the insubordinate Diotrephes, but to one Gaius who is in close relation with himself, sending a letter at the same time to the whole Church of the region—for there should be no doubt that the reference in III John 7 is to II John. In II John 12 and III John 13, 14, the intention is expressed of coming to call Diotrephes to account. John's confidence in his own position is noteworthy, especially in connection with the question why and in what sense he designates himself (II John 1; III John 1) as " the elder." Since in the province there were certainly far more than the seven churches of Rev. i., each with its own local presbyter, he could hardly, writing to another church (II John 13) as one of the elders of his own community, have called himself simply " the elder," even if (as III John and Rev. i.–iii. seem to show) the monarchical episcopate had already developed in that region. It is more probably a title of honor, not chosen by himself but open to him to use after it had become customary in the churches to call him by it in the sense of the venerable teacher of the whole region, the father who calls all the Christians in it his children. That there was such a venerable old man in Asia Minor at that time, who would be designated with quite sufficient clearness by the title " the elder," and that his name was John, is known from Papias, who was a disciple of his (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, III., xxxix. 15), and so return is made to John of Ephesus as the assumed or actual author of the two short letters. That elsewhere, in places where this designation was not familiar, doubts were raised as to the identity of authorship with I John precisely on the ground of this peculiar designation, can be readily understood, as also that after the discovery of a " John the Presbyter " these epistles were ascribed to him, as by Jerome (*De vir. ill.*, ix., xviii.) after the suggestion of Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, III., xxv. 3).

3. The Gospel:

1. Its Character.

This resembles the works already discussed in being directed not to a general public, but to a definite circle of readers, whom the author twice addresses (xix. 35, xx. 31) as a preacher might his hearers. By this fact and by tradition the view is supported that the author of the Apocalypse and the Epistles is here addressing the same churches; and it is confirmed by the undeniable likeness of both language and religious views, to say nothing of the obvious fact that the Gospel is destined for readers unfamiliar with the speech and customs of the Jews. In i. 14, 16, as well as in xix. 35, he reckons himself, precisely as in the Epistles, among the eye-witnesses of the facts which he relates.

2. Internal Testimony to Authorship.

Note must be taken, however, of the theory of Weizsäcker, that the book is a product of the school of John the apostle, written in the spirit and the name of the master, and that of Renan (from the thirteenth edition of his *Vie de Jésus* on; followed, though a little less definitely, by Harnack) that "John the Presbyter," a disciple of the apostle and depending on his narrative, wrote it. If it be noticed that throughout the whole Gospel the two apostles who with Peter stood next to Jesus are never once named, it appears that this is too constant an attitude to be fortuitous, and that it can be explained only by the author's feeling that it was unfitting to introduce into the sacred history his own and his parents' names. The "disciple whom Jesus loved" of the last supper (xiii. 21–25) must have been an apostle, and one of the inner circle even among the apostles. That he was the author of the book is expressly stated in the supplementary chapter xxi. The solemn close of chapter xx., looking back upon a completed work, shows that this was not written at the same time with the rest; but the fact that neither in the Fathers nor in the oldest versions and the extant Greek manuscripts is there any trace of an existence of the book without this chapter shows that it must have been added before the Gospel had been widely circulated, or soon after the composition of the first twenty chapters. Whoever, then, wrote xxi. 24 testified in the apostle's lifetime that he was the author of the book; and the internal evidence for its authenticity is supported by a unanimous tradition which apparently can be traced up to his very friends and disciples. If the relation between the writer and the first readers was as close as it appears to have been, there is no room for deliberate deceit on the part of the former or for unconscious error of the latter. Those who have upheld the opposite theory have depended far too little on positive study of the text and positive information to assert that the book was written by Cerinthus, or by a second-century Gentile Christian with Gnostic tendencies, or by a Jewish Christian who had never been outside of Syria, or by a disciple or disciples of John at Ephesus, or by a "Presbyter John."

3. Objections to Johannine Authorship.

The upholders of these various views have agreed only in the negative judgment that an immediate disciple of Christ can not have written the book, for the reason that its contents are incredible on historical, psychological, or philosophico-dogmatic grounds. Of these grounds the following brief sketch will suffice: (1) On account of the great difference in language and manner of thought it seems impossible, they say, that the same man (even at different periods of his life) could have written the Gospel and the letters on one side and the Apocalypse on the other. (2) If the synoptic Gospels are older than the fourth, as both tradition and criticism show, and are a trustworthy reproduction of the general tradition of the years 60–100, then the incompatibility of their narrative with John's in the whole plan of the story and in certain important details (for example the chronology of the Passion) will render impossible a belief in the composition of the Fourth Gospel by an eye-witness. (3) Still more, the picture given in it of the person of Jesus, his relation to his disciples, and the tone of his reputed speeches differ fundamentally from those given by the synoptics; and this difference leads to the belief that the Fourth Gospel was written by a man of the second or third generation, under the influence of speculative and churchly ideas. (4) One of these ideas is the doctrine of the Logos, which comes from Philo or the Alexandrian philosophy and can not have been known by the Galilean fisherman. (5) The way in which the writer introduces himself with apparent unconsciousness, at the same time putting himself forward as the favorite disciple, is morally more conceivable in a later writer who more or less assumed the character of the apostle than in the latter himself. (6) Evidences of ignorance of the historical and geographical conditions of Palestine in the time of Christ are adduced, though less confidently in modern times than was formerly the case. (7) The tradition as to the residence of the apostle John at Ephesus is partly uncertain, because depending on the testimony of writings bearing his name; partly equivocal in that the apostolic character of the John who lived there between 70 and 100 is not clearly shown; and partly unfavorable to the composition of the Fourth Gospel by this John, of whom words and acts are reported (e.g., in connection with the Quartodeciman controversy) which do not harmonize with the thought of the evangelist. While a discussion of the first six points is impossible here, the last must be dealt with at some length, because it relates to the last period of the apostle's life and because the whole historical foundation for his literary activity is involved in it.

4. John's Residence at Ephesus.

Even if the Apocalypse is pseudonymous, which few nowadays maintain, it still teaches that at the date of its composition (about 95 A.D.) there was a well-known and revered Christian of Jewish birth named John, whose permanent home was on the mainland and his enforced habitation at that time the island of Patmos. As far as tradition speaks clearly, it constantly designates him as an apostle, whether it mentions him as the author of the Johannine writings, or as a teacher in the province of Asia, or as an authority for the ecclesiastical usages prevalent there. There has been much discussion of the passage in Eusebius where he cites Papias, and apparently in part at least misunderstands him. Without discussing this at length, it is safe to say that the "Presbyter John" is a product of the critical and exegetical weakness of Eusebius; and the question becomes merely who was the John who (according to the testimony of the Apocalypse and of his disciples Polycarp, Papias, and the other "presbyters" mentioned by Irenæus) lived at Ephesus in the closing years of the first century, exercised a predominant influence on the Church of the province, died after the accession of Trajan or about 100, and (by the testimony of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, who was baptized about 125–130) was buried there. All clearly intelligible tradition says that he was the son of Zebedee chosen by Christ as an apostle. There is not a counter-statement to be found in the first eight centuries; an apparent assertion of Papias that the apostle John was put to death by the Jews in Palestine is seen when investigated to refer to John the Baptist.

5. Conclusion.

It is safe, then, to say that the apostle John, with other disciples of Christ, came from Palestine to Asia Minor. If Polycarp, on the day of his death (Feb. 23, 155), was looking back on eighty-six years of life as a Christian, not as a man, and was thus baptized in 69, and if his conversion (according to Irenæus, *Haer.*, III., iii. 4) was the work of an apostle, this migration to Asia Minor must have occurred before that date, possibly as a result of the outbreak of the Jewish war. John, then perhaps not more than sixty or sixty-five, would thus have been able to devote some thirty years to the fostering of Christian life in the province. His image as a priest in pontifical garments long lived in the memory of the Christians of Ephesus (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, V., xxiv. 3). The whilom "Son of Thunder" was not in his old age a subtle philosophical disputant nor the soft-hearted preacher of a weak tolerance, but stands out a sharply defined character, his own position firmly taken and earnestly pressing others to decide between light and darkness, Christ and Antichrist. The John of the years between 27 and 52 pictured in the older New-Testament writings, stands out less clearly in the Apocalypse, in which his task was merely to reproduce what had been given him, than in the Epistles, in which he exercised his office as teacher and head of the Church of Asia Minor with unexhausted power. He is recognized again in the story left by his disciple Polycarp (Irenæus, *Haer.*, III., iii. 4) of his encounter with the heretic Cerinthus in the public bath at Ephesus, and in the account (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, V., xxiv. 3, 16) of his celebration of the Christian Passover in the form borrowed from the old covenant and familiar to him in Palestine. (T. ZAHN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Various phases of the subject are discussed in the treatises on the Church history of the period, e.g. Schaff, *Christian Church*, i. 406–431; in works on the theology of the Bible and the N. T. (so particularly Beyschlag); and in works on introduction to the Bible and the N. T. Some of the most elaborate introductions are prefixed to the commentaries, e.g., to Westcott's treatment in the *Bible Commentary*.

On the life of St. John consult, besides Schaff, ut sup., and McGiffert, as below: F. Trench, *The Life and Character of St. John*, London, 1850; M. Krenkel, *Der Apostel Johannes*, Leipsic, 1871; J. M. Macdonald, *The Life and Writings of St. John*, New York, 1880; P. J. Gloag, *Life of St. John*, London, 1892.

General commentaries on the Johannine writings are H. Ewald, *Die johannischen Schriften*, 2 vols., Göttingen, 1861; J. T. Harris, *The Writings of the Apostle John*, 2 vols., London, 1889; H. J. Holtzmann, *Evangelium, Briefe, und Offenbarung des Johannes*, Tübingen, 1908. An excellent review of recent Johannean literature is furnished in the *Theologische Rundschau*, Sept.–Oct., 1906, Apr.–May, 1907 (all of these very valuable to the close student).

Questions of introduction to the Apocalypse are discussed in: F. Lücke, *Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannes*, Bonn, 1852; H. Gebhardt, *Der Lehrbegriff der Apokalypse und sein Verhältniss zum Lehrbegriff des Evangeliums und der Epistel des Johannes*, Gotha, 1873, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1878; D. Völter, *Die Entstehung der Apokalypse*, Freiburg, 1885; idem, *Das Problem der Apokalypse*, ib. 1893; E. Vischer, *Offenbarung Johannis*, in *TU*, ii. 3 (1886); H. Schön, *L'Origine de l'Apocalypse*, Paris, 1887; P. Schmidt, *Ueber die Composition der Offenbarung*, Freiburg, 1891; W. Bousset, *Der Antichrist in der Ueberlieferung des Judentums, des N. T., und der alten Kirche*, Göttingen, 1895; H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, ib. 1895; J. Wellhausen, *Analyse der Offenbarung Johannis*, Berlin, 1907.

The exegetical literature on the Johannine writings is exceedingly voluminous; the following is a selection of that on the Apocalypse: H. B. Swete, London, 1909 (best); A. Ewald, Leipsic, 1828; M. Stuart, 2 vols., Andover, 1845; E. W. Hengstenberg, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1861–62, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1851–52; J. H. A. Ebrard, Königsberg, 1853; F. Bleek, Berlin, 1862, Eng. transl. London, 1875; E. B. Elliott, 4 vols., ib. 1862; G. Volkmar, Zurich, 1862; H. Kienlen, Paris, 1870; E. Renan, *L'Antechrist*, Paris, 1873, Eng. transl., London, 1897; T. Kliefoth, Leipsic, 1874; F. Düsterdieck, Göttingen, 1877; W. Lee, in *Bible Commentary*, London, 1881; C. J. Vaughan, ib. 1882; J. T. Beck, Gütersloh, 1884; J. Waller, Freiburg, 1885; E. Vischer, Leipsic, 1886; A. Chauffard, 2 vols., Paris, 1888; G. Spitta, Halle, 1889; W. H. Simcox, in *Cambridge Bible*, Cambridge, 1890; D. Brown, London, 1891; B. Weiss, Leipsic, 1891; W. Milligan, London, 1892; W. Bousset, Göttingen, 1895; J. M. Gibson, *Apocalyptic Sketches*, London, 1901; E. Huntingford, ib. 1901; J. A. Petit, Paris, 1901; L. Pragen, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1901; A. Reymond, Lausanne, 1903; J. B. Knappenberger, Syracuse, N. Y., 1908; J. J. L. Ruttow, *Essays on the Apocalypse*, London, 1908; J. L. Scott, ib. 1909.

Commentaries on the Epistles are: B. F. Westcott, London, 1892; W. Augusti, *Die katholischen Briefe*, 2 vols., Lemgo, 1801; J. W. Grashof, Essen, 1830; J. H. A. Ebrard, Königsberg, 1859, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1860; W. Alexander, in *Bible Commentary*, London, 1881; idem, in *Expositor's Bible*, ib. 1889; A. Plummer, ib. 1886; J. J. Lias, *The First Epistle of St. John*, ib. 1887; E. Dryander, *The First Epistle of St. John*, ib. 1899; J. E. Belser, Freiburg, 1906; R. Law, *The Tests of Life. A Study of I John*, Edinburgh, 1909; G. G. Findlay, London, 1909.

Critical discussions concerning the Gospel may be found in: F. C. Baur, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien*, Tübingen, 1847; A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Evangelien nach ihrer Entstehung*, Leipsic, 1854; A. Sabatier, *Essai sur les sources de la vie de Jésus*, Paris, 1866; G. Volkmar, *Der Ursprung unserer Evangelien*, Zurich, 1866; G. Müller, *Die Entstehung der vier Evangelien*, Berlin, 1877; C. Tischendorf, *Wann wurden unsere Evangelien verfasst?* Leipsic, 1880; B. F. Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, London, 1895; C. Weizsäcker, *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte, ihre Quellen und den Gang ihrer Entwicklung*, Tübingen, 1901. Consult also the special discussions: B. Bauer, *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte des Johannes*, Bremen, 1840; C. Wittichen, *Der geschichtliche Charakter des Evangeliums Johannes*, Elberfeld, 1868; J. Orr, *Authenticity of St. John's Gospel*, London, 1870; C. E. Luthardt, *Der johannische Ursprung des 4. Evangeliums*, Leipsic, 1874, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1885; W. Beyschlag, *Zur johannischen Frage*, Gotha, 1876; W. Sanday, *Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*, London, 1876; idem, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, ib. 1905; E. Abbot, *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, Boston, 1880; A. Thoma, *Die Genesis des johannischen Evangeliums* Berlin, 1882; F. Godet, *Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, London, 1884; H. H. Evans, *St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel*, ib. 1888; H. W. Watkins, *Modern Criticism in its Relation to the Fourth Gospel*, ib. 1890; P. J. Gloag, *Introduction to the Johannine Writings*, Edinburgh, 1891; G. W. Gilmore, *The Johannean Problem*, Philadelphia, 1895; A. C. McGiffert, *Hist. of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, pp. 606–635, New York, 1897; J. Reville, *Le Quatrième Evangile*, Paris, 1900; H. T. Purchas, *Johannine Problem*, London, 1901; J. Grill, *Die Entstehung des 4. Evangeliums*, Tübingen, 1902; W. Wrede, *Charakter und Tendenz des Johannisevangeliums*, ib. 1903; J. Drummond, *The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, London, 1904; H. L. Jackson, *The Fourth Gospel and Some Recent German Criticism*, New York, 1906; K. Meyer, *Der Zeugniszweck des Evangelisten Johannes*, Gütersloh, 1906; W. Richmond, *The Gospel of the Rejection: a Study of the*

Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Three, London, 1906; E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology*, Edinburgh, 1907; E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary*, London, 1905; idem, *Johannine Grammar*, ib. 1906; J. d'Alma, *La Controverse du Quatrième Évangile*, Paris, 1907; H. P. Forbes, *The Johannine Literature and the Acts of the Apostles*, New York, 1907; J. A. Robinson, *The Historical Character of St. John's Gospel*, London, 1908; J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Johannis*, Berlin, 1908; F. W. Worsley, Edinburgh, 1909.

Commentaries on the Gospel are: H. Klee, Mainz, 1829; F. Lücke, 4 vols., Bonn, 1843; A. Maier, 2 vols., Freiburg, 1843–45; A. Tholuck, Hamburg, 1857, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1870; S. J. Astié, Geneva, 1864; E. W. Hengstenberg, Berlin, 1867, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1865; E. H. Sears, Boston, 1874; C. E. Luthardt, Nuremberg, 1875, Eng. transl., 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1876–79; D. B. von Haneburg, 2 vols., Munich, 1880; A. Plummer, in *Cambridge Bible*, Cambridge, 1881; F. Godet, 3 vols., Paris, 1881–85, Eng. transl., 2 vols., New York, 1885; B. F. Westcott, new ed., London, 1908; P. Schanz, Tübingen, 1885; A. Hovey, Philadelphia, 1886; R. Govett, London, 1887; O. Holtzmann, Darmstadt, 1887; G. F. Wahle, Gotha, 1888; T. Whitelaw, Glasgow, 1888; W. Bruce, London, 1891; M. Dods, 2 vols., London, 1890–92; W. Milligan and W. F. Moulton, Edinburgh, 1898; J. C. Ceulemans, Molines, 1901; A. E. Hillard, London, 1901; E. W. Rice, New York, 1902; A. Loisy, Paris, 1903: A. Plummer, in *Cambridge Greek Testament;* J. E. Belser, Freiburg, 1905; W. Kelly, London, 1908; T. Zahn, Leipsic, 1908.

JOHN OF AVILA. See Avila, Juan de.

JOHN THE BAPTIST: The forerunner of Christ. The date and place of his birth are uncertain, possibly at Hebron, six months before Christ (cf. Luke i. 36); d. c. 29 or 30 A.D. He was the son of the priest Zacharias and of his wife Elizabeth, of Aaronic descent, born in their old age.

Life and Preaching.

His birth was announced by an angel (Luke i. 13). The angelic injunction that he should drink neither wine nor strong drink points to his taking the vows of a Nazarite. Luke i. 80 does not definitely indicate a priestly education, but his familiarity with the prophets, especially with Isaiah, must have had some basis in instruction. His early retirement into the desert of Judah may be connected with the death of his aged parents and also indicates a break with Pharisaic conceptions. His appearance was that of an ascetic: his clothing consisted of a garment of camel's hair bound by a leathern girdle; his food, locusts and wild honey (Matt. iii. 4; Mark i. 6); indeed, John shared with the Essenes and related spirits the ascetic tendency which had its basis in the earnestness of the time. The ideals of the independent tendency of his spirit were the prophets of Israel, Elijah, the man of actions, and Isaiah, the man of words. The central theme of his preaching was, in opposition to the righteousness of works, repentance because of the near approach of the kingdom of God; but God's kingdom and God's judgment were in the eyes of this greatest of prophets, as well as in those of his predecessors, inseparably connected. In the coming judgment God's wrath will reveal itself; whoever intends to escape it must make mighty efforts (Matt. iii. 7, 8); the announcement of the kingdom and of the judgment involves the Baptist's Messianic preaching. The Messianic salvation is for him so near that he considers himself the herald who precedes the appearance of the king. He was in reality the second Elijah, although in his humility he rejected this claim. There is an important distinction between John's Messianic preaching of judgment (as compared with the earlier prophets) and the expectation of the people. According to the latter, the judgment spares the people of Israel; according to John, Israel is affected first by it. Here is that break with narrow nationalism which was developed more fully in Paul. The preaching by John of the kingdom, the judgment, and repentance created a sensation in the land. His fame extended far and wide and among all classes, publicans and soldiers, Pharisees and Sadducees (Matt. iii. 7, xi. 7); but these representatives of official and pious Judaism he greeted as a "generation of vipers" (Matt. iii. 7) of whom the first requirement was renewal of the heart. John represented himself, in accordance with Isa. xl. 3, as a "voice crying in the wilderness" (John i. 23).

His Baptism, Teaching, and Death.

In accordance with the words of Isa. i. 16, "Wash ye, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings," he introduced baptism as an action symbolic of his spoken word. He baptized all who came receptively to hear him at Bethabara, of the Jordan (Matt. iii. 6; Mark i. 5), connecting with the rite a confession of sins, and the purpose was forgiveness of sins. John gathered his disciples from all sides, and, according to Luke xi. 1 and Mark ii. 18, taught a definite form of prayer, inducing them not only to adopt an ascetic mode of life, but also to engage in regular fasts. It was at Bethabara that the meeting of Jesus with John and his baptism took place. Josephus mentions John the Baptist in connection with the war between Aretas, king of Petra, and Herod. The Jewish people, according to Josephus (*Ant.*, XVIII., v. 2), saw in the defeat of Herod a just divine punishment for having unjustly killed John "called the Baptist." Herod, he continues, killed him because of fear that his powerful influence upon the people might lead to rebellion. John was cast into the prison of Machaerus and then beheaded. Josephus describes John as an excellent man, who admonished the Jews to come to baptism, practising virtue and justice toward each other and piety toward God. To Josephus John was only a preacher of morals; the political historian could not do justice to John's religious and Messianic importance. The accounts of Josephus and of the Gospels, Matt. xiv.; Mark vi.; Luke ix., differ in regard to the motive for the execution of John; Josephus considers it merely political, while the Gospels positively connect it with Herod's marriage with his sister-in-law contrary to Levitical law (Lev. xviii. 16).

The time of the death of John can not be definitely decided. Herod's journey to Rome with the following marriage of Herodias must have taken place before the overthrow of Sejanus, 31 A.D.

Chronology and Significance of John.

If John appeared publicly in the fifteenth year of Tiberius and labored about six months, and if there followed an imprisonment of several months, his execution may have occurred in the fall of 29 or in 30. Jesus praised John for his indomitable firmness (Matt. xi. 7 sqq.) and conceded to him the highest rank in the economy of the old covenant (Matt. xi. 11). But at the same time he did not fail to define his limitations in that the trend of his teaching was Pharisaical, concerned with the covenant of the law and with a legal justice that could not dispense with fasting (Mark ii. 18 sqq.) and therefore did not lead further than to the baptism of water. Yet a large number of passages in the Gospels make clear John's importance in relation to the Messianic kingdom, the immediate coming of which he was able to announce.

(A. Ruegg.)

Bibliography: The subject is discussed with fulness in many of the works on the life of Christ—this literature is often especially rich—and in the works on the Apostolic age of Christianity. Special treatment is to be found in: R. Holmes, *On the Prophecies and Testimony of John the Baptist*, London, 1783; W. C. Duncan, *The Life, Character, and Acts of John the Baptist*, New York, 1853; E. Haupt, *Johannes der Täufer*, Gütersloh, 1874; E. Breesh, *Johannes der Täufer*, Leipsic, 1881; A. M. Rymington, *Vox clamantis; Life and Ministry of John the Baptist*, London, 1882; H. Köhler, *Johannes der Täufer*, Halle, 1884; A. McCullagh, *The Peerless Prophet; or, The Life and Times of John the Baptist*, New York, 1888; R. C. Houghton, *John the Baptist, . . . his Life and Work*, ib. 1889; R. H. Reynolds, *John the Baptist*, London, 1890; E. Barde, *Jean-Baptiste*, Paris, 1892; A. C. McGiffert, *Hist. of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, passim, New York, 1897; P. A. E. Sillevis Smith, *Johannes de Dooper, de Wegbereider des Heeren*, Amsterdam, 1908; T. Innitzer, *Johannes der Täufer*, Vienna, 1908; Schürer, *Geschichte*, i. 436 sqq., Eng. transl., I., ii. 23–29; *DB*, ii. 677–680; *EB*, ii. 2498–2504; *JE*, vii. 218–219.

JOHN OF BASEL. See Hiltalinger, Johann.

JOHN OF CAPISTRANO. See Capistrano, Giovanni di.

JOHN OF CHUR (COIRE), surnamed **RUETBERG.** See Friends of God.

JOHN OF THE CROSS. See Carmelites, § 3.

Life.

JOHN OF DAMASCUS (called Chrysorrhoas, "streaming with gold," i.e., the golden speaker): The last of the Greek Fathers and the most authoritative theologian for the whole Eastern Church; b. presumably in Damascus and before 700; d., in all probability at the monastery of Mar Saba (8 m. s.e. of Jerusalem), shortly before 754 (cf. acts vi. and vii. of the Second Council of Nicæa, 787, in Mansi, *Concilia*, xiii. 356, 400). His family, though Christian, held a high hereditary public office under the Moslem rulers of Damascus, apparently that of head of the tax department for Syria. John's father filled this position, as did John himself for a time. The Arabs gave to the family the surname Mansur, which was also borne by John. Shortly after 730 he became a monk and went to Mar Saba, whither his brother by adoption, the poet Cosmas, and his teacher had preceded him. The latter was an Italian monk who had been brought to Damascus a prisoner of war and was freed by John's father. To him John owed his introduction into theology and philosophy and his comprehensive knowledge of secular science. He was ordained priest by Patriarch John V. of Jerusalem shortly after entering the monastery, but declined further advancement in hierarchical rank. When called to Jerusalem as priest of the Church there he soon returned to Mar Saba. There he wrote his chief works. Toward the end of his life he gave his writings a careful revision. His grave was shown at Mar Saba in the twelfth century, but in the fourteenth his body is said to have been transferred to Constantinople. He is honored as a saint by the Greek Church on Dec. 4, by the Latin on May 6.

Writings in Defense of Images.

Probably the earliest of John's writings, at any rate those which made his reputation, are the three "Apologetic Treatises against those Decrying the Holy Images" (Eng. transl. by Mary H. Allies, *St. John Damascene on Holy Images, Followed by Three Sermons on the Assumption*, London, 1899), called forth by the vigorous measures of the Emperor Leo III. (see Images and Image-worship, II.). The first (*MPG*, xciv. 1232 sqq.), written while John was still in public life in Damascus, is complete, learned, and skilful, and straightway put a good literary defense in the hands of the friends of images. Since John was out of his power, Leo attempted to bring him under suspicion of treason to the caliph (cf. "Life," ut inf., chaps. xv.–xvi.). Addressing himself to the people and patriarch of Constantinople, John professes to write reluctantly, from a sense of duty, wishing only "to reach a helping hand to truth when attacked." His manner is definite and incisive, yet restrained and dignified, that of a man of good breeding, inflexible energy, and knowledge of ecclesiastical matters. Images are justified on the ground that God, who is "not to be attained unto, without body, invisible, not circumscribed in space, and without form," yet has become visible in the Logos, which was made flesh. Therefore an image of "the flesh of God which has been seen" can be made, and in making it there is nothing forbidden or unchristian. The Mosaic prohibition was directed against something quite different. "Worship" (*proskunēsis*) is a symbol of dependence and reverence; it has many forms, the highest being *latreia*, which is due to God alone; elsewhere for Christians it is merely an expression of reverence (*sebeia*), and is properly accorded to everything connected with salvation—the cross, the Gospels, the altar, etc. "I worship not the material [*hylē*]," he declares, "but I worship the fabricator [*dēmiourgon*] of the material, the one who . . . through the material has wrought my salvation." The image becomes for him one of the means of salvation, and it and the God-man approach so close together that there is little practical difference between them. Refined speculations, like the attempt to measure the extent of the consonance, belong to a later stage of the controversy. Furthermore, John does not attempt to brand the Christology of the iconoclasts as heretical. Images of the "mother of God" are to be tolerated beside those of Christ, and also of the saints. Finally, he cites passages from the Fathers with comments to show that the entire doing away with images would be a sad departure from tradition. The second and third treatises (*MPG*, xciv. 1284 sqq.) contain nothing essential which is not also in the first. The second is the most popular and vehement, the third the most formal and theological. The second presupposes the situation of 730 when Leo had deposed the Patriarch Germanus, the third may have been written or revised after John became a monk; it is to some extent a compilation of the other two. The "Demonstrative Treatise about the Images" (*MPG*, xcv. 309 sqq.), the "Letter to Theophilus" (*MPG*, xcv. 345 sqq.), and the tract in *MPG*, xcvi. 1348 sqq., are not genuine.

Chief Dogmatic Work.

John was no mystic, and he hardly touched the problems which later agitated the mystagogic theology (see MYSTAGOGIC THEOLOGY); but nearly all fruitful and instructive theological questions were treated by him, and his treatment is definitive for the East. In the West, too, his influence has been considerable, but here men like Peter Lombard and Thomas Aquinas surpassed and displaced him. For the East his great work, the "Fount of Knowledge" (*MPG*, xciv. 521 sqq.) became the standard. It is commended by substantial merits in the author. He is pious and scientific, deferential to authority but learned and acute, able to accept the current body of dogmas and yet give it new significance and spiritual vitality. If he never rises above the level of a good average excellence, he never falls below it. He had no ideas of his own and so never disturbed the peace of the Church or fell under suspicion as an unsafe leader. For modern times he presents a convenient and instructive summary of what the ancient Greek Church accomplished in the field of dogma—a sum total of holy concepts enigmatical in character and supernaturally perceived. The work is dedicated to John's brother by adoption, Cosmas, at one time a monk of Mar Saba, later (743 ?) bishop of Majumas (the port of Gaza). John explains this plan as threefold. First, he will present "the best things of the wise among the Greeks" and, like a bee, "will gather salvation from the enemy" (i.e., the philosophers, especially Aristotle). Then he will set forth "the vaporings of heresies hated by God." Thirdly, he will exhibit the truth in the words of "the God-inspired prophets and the God-taught fishermen and the God-filled [*theophoros*] shepherds and teachers"; that is, by quotations from the Bible and the Fathers, the latter receiving much the greater consideration. The "Philosophical Chapters" (part i.; 68 chapters in Le Quien and Migne; a shorter edition in 15 may be earlier) comprise a comprehensive treatise on dialectics and are cited under this title. In the second part John follows Epiphanius for the older time (the first 80 heresies), then Theodoret and others, and finally makes some independent remarks, especially concerning Mohammedanism. Some codices give 100 heresies, others a few more. The third part ("Exposition of the Orthodox Faith"; Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2d ser., ix.) was divided by John himself into 100 chapters. Later and in the West it was made up in four books, of which the first treats of the God-head (the Trinity), the second of the created universe (heaven and earth, angels, devils, mankind, freedom of the will, providence), the third chiefly of the person of Christ, then the mysteries, images, church festivals and customs, and the like, finally of Antichrist and the resurrection. Manuscripts often contain only parts i. and iii., part ii. being less important and copied separately.

His Teaching.

John writes clearly and concisely, speaking for the most part in the words of his sources, but seldom names his authorities, the chief of whom are Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Dionysius the Areopagite, and Leontius. As philosopher he is an Aristotelian of the fifth and sixth centuries, that is, with a strong infusion of Neoplatonism. Philosophy furnishes the first principles, but it is unable to apprehend and develop them aright especially as concerns the true knowledge of God, being but the handmaiden of faith, which is the queen. In final analysis, philosophy for John is merely the teacher of the right terminology, theology is nothing more than a working over of the opinions of "the holy fathers," who have first been able to understand the terms correctly. It is the juristic method applied to dogmatics—in fact, scholasticism in general is the incursion of jurisprudence into the field of theology. John's conception of God stops short of making him a person. It is true he ascribes personal attributes to the supreme being and herein influenced appreciably the Eastern Church; but, notwithstanding, he attained to no other idea of fellowship and communion with God than a physical blending through *theōria*, "vision." Herein is the religiously significant motive of the image question. More extended analysis of John's idea of God will be found in F. Kattenbusch, *Vergleichende Konfessionskunde*, i. 310 sqq., Freiburg, 1892. For his doctrine of the Trinity and Christology the histories of dogma mentioned in the bibliography must be consulted; that by Bach (i. 49 sqq.) is particularly instructive. John does not allegorize the Scriptures, and he propounds no doctrine of the Church or the hierarchy. He refrains from discussion of the creed and characterizes the formula of faith ("Orthodox Faith," iv. 11) as a simple and inartistic composition, showing that he had the creed before him. His section on the creation ("Orthodox Faith," ii.) is a whole treatise on astronomy and geography with the science of water, air, and fire. His doctrine of the Eucharist deserves mention because it is one of the few vital questions on which he did not speak the final word for his Church, although he gave the direction to later thought (cf. Steitz, *Die Abendmahlslehre der griechischen Kirche* in *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, xii. 275 sqq., Gotha, 1867; Kattenbusch, *Konfessionskunde*, ut sup., i. 415 sqq.). The chief points are three: (1) that there is a real change (*metabolē*) and remaking (*metapoiēsis*); (2) that the eucharistic body which results from the change is that born of the Virgin Mary; (3) that the change is analogous to that by which food is assimilated and changed into our flesh. He disclaims the doctrine that Christ's body comes again to earth in any manner in the eucharistic form, and teaches not transubstantiation, but "transformation" through "assumption." The "Fount of Knowledge" was brought to the West in the twelfth century and was translated into Latin by Burgundio of Pisa in the time of Pope Eugenius III. (1144–53). Neither

Burgundio's translation nor another by Panetius, a Carmelite, has been printed.

The "Sacred Parallels."

A counterpart to the "Fount of Knowledge" is furnished in the "Sacred Parallels" (*MPG*, xcv. 1040–xcvi. 544), ascribed to John of Damascus, but not universally accepted as his work. As printed in Le Quien and Migne it has two prefaces, of which the second outlines a collection of ethical and hortatory maxims from the Bible and the Fathers arranged alphabetically under titles. There are to be three books treating respectively of God, human things, and virtue and vice. The title is given simply as "the Holy Things" (*ta hiera*), and, indeed, it is hard to see how the matter of books i. and ii. could be arranged in parallels. The first preface, however, which is much shorter, gives a description for the entire work applicable only to the third book of the second preface, and promises to set "the virtues and the corresponding vices" as "parallels." Quotations from Philo and Josephus are to be added to those from the Fathers. The work which follows in Le Quien and Migne is not in three parts, but is a single book, although it contains material which fits the plan of the second preface and is alphabetically arranged. It is very evidently a revision of another and more extensive writing, made, presumably, by combining and compressing the three books into one and arranging the matter alphabetically. The manuscripts differ widely. Loofs showed that the two manuscripts known to Le Quien are both based upon an original work in three parts, two of which are preserved independently and separately and the third in a revision by the so-called Antonius Melissa (more correctly in the *Melissa* of the monk Antonius) of the eleventh century. The conclusions of Holl are to be accepted in the main as correct. He says: "The *Hiera* comprised originally three books. . . . In each the matter was arranged in a long list of chapters (*titloi*), some more comprehensive, some more concise. . . . The chapters of the first and second books were arranged alphabetically according to the catch-words; in the third book the author abandoned this arrangement and, following a favorite method, chose to set a virtue and a vice one against the other, whence he named this book 'the Parallels.' . . . In richness and copiousness the work surpassed all similar collections; the citations reached to the thousands and included parts of sermons of Basil and Chrysostom. To this great extent of the work is it due that it has not been preserved entire. . . . Neither of the two extant codices of books i. and ii. is a faithful copy, but each is an abridgment of the corresponding book of the original work." Concerning the author, Holl pronounces decidedly for John of Damascus, arguing from the very good tradition which ascribes the work to him and a comparison of the "Sacred Parallels" with the "Fount of Knowledge." Loofs, relying on a scholium to the manuscript of the second part, suggested Leontius of Byzantium (d. 543). Holl finds that John was largely dependent on Maximus Confessor, from whom he borrowed the idea of an edifying book made up of sentences from the Bible and the Fathers, even incorporating a work of Maximus in his own. However, in the number of themes treated and authorities cited, as well as in the length of the passages quoted, he greatly surpassed Maximus; and he attempted to give an orderly arrangement to his work as Maximus did not. "It is surprising," Holl continues (p. 392), "what antitheses are set side by side—motives of the most paltry worldly wisdom by the side of ideas of the highest moral import; and there is as great lack of connection between the individual ethical problems as of effort to solve them by any principle." The explanation is not far to seek. "There is no close connection between dogma and moral duty. Only two dogmas enter at all—the doctrines of the Trinity and of the last judgment form the framework in which the whole is enclosed." The "Parallels" are a true picture of the type of moral thought which remains peculiarly that of the Greek Church.

Hymns and Minor Writings.

John is not only the most renowned theologian of the Eastern Church, but, with his brother Cosmas, he is also its most esteemed hymn-writer. He was formerly thought to be the originator of the *oktoichos* (the hymn-book for the daily service), but more probably he only revised and improved it. Like Eastern hymn-writers in general he composed both words and music. His "canons" (compositions of highly complicated structure consisting of eight or nine hymns, each of three or four strophes and each having its own form and melody) reached the highest point of art and skill. Those in iambic meter for Christmas, Epiphany, and Pentecost are peculiar in that they are both quantitative and rhythmical; they are also very difficult acrostics and two have each 130 lines and the same number of letters in the distichs. Of minor writings ascribed to John, the early "Tract on Right Thinking" (*MPG*, xciv. 1421 sqq.) is genuine. It is a reverent and submissive apology for everybody under the metropolitan of Damascus, treating first of the creed, then naming all heresies which were to be rejected. A dislike, even contempt, for Origen, is evident (vi.). Theologically the tract has little significance. But it shows the regard felt for John in Damascus. Perhaps the same may be said of the "book" which immediately follows in Migne (xciv. 1436 sqq.), said to have been written at the request of Peter, metropolitan of Damascus, for an exposition of the faith. Other tracts are interesting because of their form (some of them dialogues) or because they are designated as "dictated" by John and so present him answering questions propounded by disciples (e.g., the "Dialogue against Manicheans," *MPG*, xciv. 1505 sqq.; the "Conversation between a Saracen and a Christian," *MPG*, xciv. 1585 sqq.; the "Introduction to Elementary Dogmatics," *MPG*, xcv. 99). For other dogmatic tracts, consult Langen, 161 sqq., 173 sqq. The contents of John's ascetic writings are important for the Greek Church. Langen gives summaries of them, as of all of John's writings (for "On the Fasts," *MPG*, xcv. 64 sqq., cf. Langen, 166 sqq.; for "On the Eight Spirits of Vice," *MPG*, xcv., 80 sqq., cf. Langen, 169 sqq., and O. Zöckler, *Das Lehrstück von den*

Sieben Hauptsünden, pp. 53 sqq., Munich, 1893). The "On Dragons" and "On Witches" (*MPG*, xciv. 1600 sqq.) are only fragments of a larger work. The two short expositions of the Eucharist (*MPG*, xcv. 401 sqq.) and the tract "On the Unleavened Bread" (*MPG*, xcv. 388 sqq.) are of doubtful authenticity. The great commentary (on all the Pauline epistles and the Hebrews) ascribed to John (*MPG*, xcv. 441 sqq.) needs further investigation. For the many homilies which go under his name (*MPG*, xcvi. 545–814; Eng. transl. of three on the Assumption in Allies, *St. John Damascene*, ut sup.), consult Langen, 213 sqq. For the "Barlaam and Josaphat," see the article under that title. The "Letter on Confession and on Binding and Loosing" (*MPG*, xcv. 284 sqq.) belongs to Symeon the New Theologian (cf. K. Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt im griechischen Mönchtum*, Leipsic, 1898).

(F. Kattenbusch.)

Bibliography: The indispensable edition of the works of John is by M. Le Quien, 2 vols., Paris, 1712, Venice, 1748, practically reproduced in *MPG*, xciv.–xcvi. The prolegomena to Le Quien are excellent. There is an Eng. transl. of the *De fide orthodoxa* in *NPNF*, 2 ser., vol. ix. His work on "Holy Images" and three "Sermons on the Assumption" are translated by Mary H. Allies, in *St. John Damascene*, ut sup. The early life, by "John, Patriarch of Jerusalem" (possibly the one who died c. 970, cf. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, iii. 466 sqq., Paris, 1740) and based upon an older lost Arabic work, is in *MPG*, xciv. 429–489. It is hagiographic in style and selection of facts. The best modern treatise is J. Langen, *Johannes von Damaskus*, Gotha, 1879, in which summaries of the writings of John are given. Other monographs are: F. A. Perrier, Strasburg, 1861; J. D. Grundlehner, Utrecht, 1877; J. H. Lupton, London, 1883. On the theology of John consult the works on the history of doctrine (*Dogmengeschichte*) of F. A. B. Nitzsch, Berlin, 1870; J. Bach, Vienna, 1873; G. Thomasius, ed. Bonwetsch, Leipsic, 1886; F. Loofs, Halle, 1893; R. Seeberg, vol. i., Erlangen, 1895; A. Dorner, Berlin, 1899, and Harnack, *Dogma*, vols. iii.–vii., passim. Further references are F. Nève, in *Revue belge et étrangère*, xii (1861), i. sqq., 117 sqq.; *DCB*, iii. 409–423 (an elaborate discussion); Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 68 sqq., 674 sqq.; O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, Freiburg, 1894; and especially F. Kattenbusch, *Vergleichende Konfessionskunde*, vol. i., Freiburg, 1892. On the "Sacred Parallels" consult Krumbacher, ut sup., pp. 216 sqq., 600 sqq.; F. Loofs, *Studien über die dem Johannes von Damaskus zugeschriebenen Parallelen*, Halle, 1892; K. Holl, in *TU*, xvi. 1 (1897), xx. 2 (1899). On John as a hymnologist and for specimens of his hymns consult: *MPG*, xcvi. 817–856, 1364–1408 (the canons at 1372–1408 are for the most part erroneously ascribed to John); *Anthologia Graeca*, ed. W. Christ and M. Paranikas, pp. xliv.–xlv., 117 sqq., 205 sqq., Leipsic, 1871; Kattenbusch, ut sup., i. 484 sqq.; Krumbacher, ut sup., pp. 674 sqq., 690 sqq.; J. Jakobi, in *ZKG*, v (1882), 177 sqq.; A. Nauck, *Mélanges gréco-romain*, vi. 2 (1894); Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 603–604; Eng. transl. of nineteen pieces in B. Pick, *Hymns and Poetry of the Eastern Church*, pp. 111 sqq., New York, 1908. Consult also W. F. Adeney, *The Greek and Eastern Churches*, pp. 211, 284, New York, 1908.

JOHN OF DARA: Jacobite bishop of Dara, in Mesopotamia, in the first half of the ninth century. He was a contemporary of Dionysius of Telmera (d. 845), who dedicated to him his great chronicle. Four of his works are known: (1) "On the Resurrection of the Bodies," in four books: (2) "On the Heavenly and Ecclesiastical Hierarchy," two books, based on the pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita (cf. Frothingham, *Stephen bar Sudaili*, Leyden, 1886, p. 66); (3) "On the Priesthood," four books (fragments in Overbeck, *Opera Ephraemi Syri*, Oxford, 1865, pp. 409–413, and *Monumenta Syriaca*, i., Innsbruck, 1869, pp. 105–110; cf. notice by Zingerle in *TQ*, 1867–68); (4) a book on the soul (extracts in *Codex Vaticanus Syriacus* 147). There is also an anaphora.

E. Nestle.

Bibliography: J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, ii. 118, 219, 347, Rome, 1719–28; G. Bickell, *Conspectus rei Syrorum literariae*, p. 42, Münster, 1871; W. Wright, *Short Hist. of Syriac Literature*, London, 1894; R. Duval, *Littérature syriaque*, Paris, 1899; *DCB*, iii. 369.

JOHN OF EPHESUS (JOHN OF ASIA): Monophysite church historian of the sixth century; b. at Amida in Mesopotamia early in the sixth century; place and date of death unknown. He became deacon in Amida in 529, was in Palestine at the outbreak of the plague in 534, and from 535 was in Constantinople, where the Monophysites had a monastery near the Golden Horn. For thirty years he was a favorite of the Emperor Justinian, who from 546 employed him to combat heathenism in Asia Minor and the capital. He styles himself "the teacher" or "overseer of the heathen" and "the destroyer of idols." He is said to have converted 70,000 and to have built ninety-six churches. He was interested in the missions to the Nubians and Alodes and recommended not to trouble them with the Christological controversies. After the death of Justinian, John suffered in the persecution of the Monophysites and excused the confused state of his church history by the incidents of his life, which forced him to write it in single leaves and to keep it concealed for several years. The first two parts, each in six books, extend from Cæsar to the sixth year of Justin (571); part i. is entirely lost; a good portion of part ii. is preserved in the so-called "Chronicle" of Dionysius of Telmera. The third part, containing biographies of men personally known to the writer—Jacobus Baradæus, Severus, Theodosius, Anthimus, and others—collected about 569, is a source of first-rate importance for the time.

E. Nestle.

Bibliography: The third part of the "Ecclesiastical History" was edited by W. Cureton, Oxford, 1853, Eng. transl. by P. Smith, ib. 1860; the rest of his writings were edited by J. P. N. Land, in *Anecdota Syriaca*, vol. ii., 4 vols., Leyden, 1862–75, and translated into Latin by W. J. van Dowen and J. P. N. Land, Amsterdam, 1889. An analysis of the second part of the "History" by F. Nau is in *Revue de l'orient chrétien*, ii (1897), 4 sqq. Consult: J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, i. 359, ii. 48, 84, Rome, 1719–1728; Gregory bar Hebraeus, *Chronicon ecclesiasticum*, i. 196; J. P. N. Land, *Johannes von Ephesus*, Leyden, 1856; idem, in *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie, Letterkunde*, vol. iii., part v., Amsterdam, 1888; W. Wright, *Short Hist. of Syriac Literature*, London, 1894; R. Duval, *Littérature syriaque*, Paris, 1899; *DCB*, iii. 370–373.

JOHN FREDERICK, THE MAGNANIMOUS: Son of John the Steadfast and elector of Saxony, 1532–1547; b. at Torgau June 30, 1503; d. at Weimar Mar. 3, 1554. He received his education from Spalatin, whom he highly esteemed during his whole life. His knowledge of history was comprehensive, and his library, which extended over all sciences, was one of the largest in Germany. He came early into personal relations with Luther, beginning to correspond with him in the days when the bull of excommunication was hurled against the Reformer, and showing himself even then a convinced adherent of the Gospel. With vivid interest he observed the development of the reformatory movement. He eagerly read Luther's writings, urged the printing of the first complete (Wittenberg) edition of his works, and in the latter years of his life promoted the compilation of the Jena edition. His father introduced him into the political and diplomatic affairs of the time, and he conducted the first negotiations of a treaty with Hesse in Kreuzburg and Friedewald. He took an active part in the disturbances caused by the Pack affair (see John the Steadfast), and Luther was grateful to him for his exertions, in spite of his youth, for the maintenance of peace. During the second diet of Speyer (1529) he temporarily assumed the reins of government in place of his father. The intrigues of Archduke Ferdinand induced him after the diet to draw up a federal statute for the Evangelical estates, which shows that he was more decidedly convinced of the right and duty of defense than his father. He accompanied the latter to the diet of Augsburg in 1530, signed with him the Augsburg Confession and was active in the proceedings. His attitude did not remain unnoticed, and won him the emperor's dislike.

At the age of twenty-one John Frederick succeeded his father. In the beginning he reigned with his stepbrother, John Ernest, but in 1542 became sole ruler. Chancellor Brück, who for years had guided the foreign relations of the country with ability and prudence, remained also his councilor, but his open and impulsive nature often led him to disregard the propositions of his more experienced adviser, so that the country was in frequent danger, especially as John Frederick was not a far-sighted politician. He consolidated the State Church by the institution of an electoral consistory (1542) and renewed the church visitation. He took a firmer and more decided stand than his father in favor of the Evangelical league, but on account of his strictly Lutheran convictions was involved in difficulties with the Landgrave of Hesse, who favored a union with the Swiss and Strasburg Evangelicals. He was averse to all propositions of Popes Clement VII. and Paul III. to win him for a council, because he was convinced that it would only serve " for the preservation of the papal and anti-Christian rule "; but to be prepared for any event, he requested Luther to summarize all articles to which he would adhere before a council, and Luther wrote the Schmalkald articles. At the diet of Schmalkald in 1537 the council was refused, and the elector treated the papal legate with open disregard and rejected the propositions of Dr. Held, the imperial legate.

He followed the efforts at agreement at Regensburg in 1541 with suspicion and refused to accept the article on justification which had been drawn up under the supervision of Contarini to suit both parties, and Luther, his steady adviser, confirmed him in his aversion. The efforts at agreement failed, and the elector contributed not a little to broaden the gulf by his interference in the ecclesiastical affairs of Halle and by aiding the Reformation which had been introduced there by Justus Jonas. His attitude became more and more stubborn and regardless of consequences, not to the advantage of the Protestant cause. In spite of the warnings of the emperor, of Brück, and of Luther, he arbitrarily set aside in 1541 the election of Julius von Pflug to the episcopal see of Naumburg, instituted Nicolaus von Amsdorf as bishop, and introduced the Reformation. In 1542 he expelled Duke Henry of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel from his country to protect the Evangelical cities Goslar and Brunswick and introduced the Reformation there. New war-like entanglements hindered Charles V. from interfering and by apparently yielding he succeeded in concealing his true intentions. The elector appeared personally at the diet of Speyer in 1544. The harmony of the emperor with the Evangelicals appeared never greater than at that time. He permitted the Regensburg declaration of 1541 to be embodied in the new recess and acknowledged all innovations which the Evangelicals had made between 1532 and 1541 because he needed the aid of the Protestants against France (see Speyer, Diets of). John Frederick actually thought that peace had come and continued the ecclesiastical reforms in his country. Even the growing discord among the allies did not disturb him.

When the Schmalkald War broke out (1546) he marched to the south at the head of his troops, but the unexpected invasion of his country by Duke Maurice compelled him to return. He succeeded in reconquering the larger part of his possessions and repelling Maurice, but suddenly the emperor hastened north and surprised the elector. The battle of Mühlberg, Apr. 24, 1547, went against him and dispersed his army; being wounded, he fell into the hands of the conqueror. The emperor condemned him to death as a convicted rebel; but, not to lose time in the siege of Wittenberg, which was defended by Sibylla, the wife of the elector, he did not execute the sentence and entered into negotiations. To save his life, John Frederick conceded the capitulation of Wittenberg, and, after having been compelled to resign the government of his country in favor of Maurice, his condemnation was changed into imprisonment for life. He was never greater and more magnanimous than in the days of his captivity, as is evident from the correspondence with his children, his wife, and his councilors. Friends and foes were compelled to acknowledge his calm behavior, his unwavering faith, and his greatness under misfortune. He steadfastly refused to renounce the Protestant faith or to acknowledge the Interim, declaring that by its acceptance he would commit a sin against the Holy Ghost, because in many articles it was against the Word of God. The sudden attack upon the emperor by Elector Maurice made an end of his imprisonment, and he was released on Sept. 1, 1552. He firmly refused to bind himself to comply in matters of religion with the decisions of a future council or diet, declaring that he was resolved to adhere until his grave to the doctrine contained in the Augsburg Confession. His homeward journey was a triumphal march. He removed the seat of government to Weimar and reformed the conditions of his country, but died within two years. A special object of his care was the University of Jena, which he planned while a prisoner in place of Wittenberg, which he had lost (1547). (T. Kolde.)

Bibliography: A. Beck, *Johann Friedrich der Mittlere*, 2 vols., Weimar, 1858; F. von Bezold, *Geschichte der deutschen Reformation*, Berlin, 1886; and literature under Luther; Reformation.

JOHN OF GOD. See Charity, Brothers of.

JOHN OF GORZE: A monastic reformer of the tenth century; b. at Vendière (near Pont-à-Mousson, 18 m. s.s.w. of Metz); d. at Gorze (9 m. w.s.w. of Metz) Mar. 7, 974. His tastes early led him in the direction of theological study and asceticism, but when he wished to retire from the world he could find no monastery near him in which strict discipline was maintained. After a visit to Rome and Monte Cassino, he drew still closer the relations which had bound him to several men of like aims, especially Einald, formerly archdeacon of Toul; and in 933 they were charged by Bishop Adelbero of Metz with the restoration of the decayed monastery of Gorze, of which Einald became abbot, with John as his principal assistant. The number of monks soon became considerable, and the influence of the movement wide-spread. Gorze became a model for the reform of all the monasteries of the diocese, and in 950 Pope Agapetus II. sent thither for monks to restore discipline in the monastery of St. Paul in Rome. After many years of zealous activity at Gorze, John was sent to Cordova by Otho III. on a mission to the Calif Abdalrahman III., and spent several years in Spain. Returning to Gorze, he was elected abbot on Einald's death in 960. The life of Gorze by his friend John, abbot of St. Arnulph at Metz (*MGH*, *Script.*, iv (1841), 335–377) takes a high rank among historical documents of the tenth century.

Bibliography: The *Vita* by John, ut sup., with commentary, is also in *ASB*, Feb., iii. 686–715. Consult: W. Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, i. 745, 785, Brunswick, 1855; Wattenbach, *DGQ*, i (1885), 344, i (1893), 370.

JOHN, GRIFFITH: Welsh Congregational missionary; b. at Swansea, Wales, Dec. 14, 1831. At the age of fourteen he began to preach in Welsh, and from 1850 to 1854 studied at Brecon College, after which he spent a few months at the Missionary College at Bedford, England. In 1855 he was assigned by the London Missionary Society to China. Until 1861 he lived in or near Shanghai. Then he removed to Hankow, being the first Protestant missionary in Central China, and made that city his headquarters until 1906. As at Shanghai, he made numerous journeys into the surrounding country, and established many churches and missions in neighboring provinces. He was in Great Britain on furlough in 1870–73 and again in 1881–1882, the latter time visiting the United States, where he has resided since 1906, when failing health obliged him to retire from active missionary life. He is the author of a large number of tracts in Chinese, and also translated the New Testament and a portion of the Old into both easy Wen-li and Mandarin colloquial.

Bibliography: R. W. Thompson, *Griffith John, the Story of Fifty Years in China*, New York, 1908.

JOHN OF LEYDEN: The common designation of Jan Beukelszoon, the leader of the Anabaptists in Münster. See Anabaptists; Münster, Anabaptists in.

JOHN THE LITTLE (Johannes Parvus, Jean Petit): French theologian; b. in Normandy; d. 1411. He became known in 1394 by the publication of *Complainte de l'église*, a French poem discussing the ecclesiastical schism and the remedies recommended in 1394 by the University of Paris. He represented the Norman people at the university and was professor of theology there 1400. He treated of the church politics of Burgundy at the national council of 1406 with unusual rigor, and on Mar. 8, 1408, defended the murder of Duke Louis of Orléans, committed at the instigation of John the Fearless of Burgundy. In this he appealed to the scholastic doctrine of tyrannicide regnant since John of Salisbury; but a council of Paris condemned the doctrine (Feb. 23, 1414). A commission of cardinals instituted by John XXIII. reversed the decision on Jan. 15, 1416; moreover, after the death of John, the rising power of Burgundy so tied the hands of Martin V. that there followed a vindication of the theologian.

(B. Bess.)

Bibliography: J. B. Schwab, *Johannes Gerson*, pp. 429 sqq., 608 sqq., Würzburg, 1858; P. Tschackert, *Peter von Ailli*, Gotha, 1877; M. D. Chapotin, *La Guerre de cent ans*, Paris, 1889; B. Bess, *Studien zur Geschichte des Konstanzer Konzils*, Marburg, 1891; M. Lossen, *Die Lehre vom Tyrannenmord in der christlichen Zeit*, Munich, 1894; H. Denifle and E. Chatelain, *Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis*, vols. iii., iv., Paris, 1894–97; *KL*, vi. 1746–1748.

JOHN OF MONTECORVINO: Franciscan missionary in China; b. at Montecorvino, Rovella (14 m. e. of Salerno), Italy, 1247; d. at Khanbaligh (now Peking), China, 1330. In 1272 he was sent by the Byzantine Emperor Michael Palæologus to Gregory X. in the matter of the union of the Greek with the Roman Church. Subsequently he visited Mongolia. On his return in 1288 he reported to Nicholas IV. the willingness of the Tatar princes to receive Christian teachers, and in 1289 he was sent by Nicholas as a missionary to the Mongolian empire. After laboring for a time in Persia and India he settled at Peking about 1292. Until 1303 he carried on his work alone. He won the friendship of the Great Khan, enlisted his interest, and, despite the determined opposition of the Nestorians, by 1305 he had built two churches and baptized 6,000 heathen adults, besides 150 boys, whom he had bought of heathen parents and collected into a school. He taught them Greek and Latin, and wrote for them psalteries, hymnaries, and breviaries. He also translated the Psaltery and the whole of the New Testament into Tatar. On hearing of the great work accomplished by him Clement V., in 1307, made him archbishop of Khanbaligh (Peking) and gave him a number of suffragans. His work was continued by his successors till 1368. His two letters are in Wadding, *Annal. frat. min.*, for year 1305, one in Eng. transl. in Yule's ed. of Marco Polo (London, 1875).

Bibliography: *KL*, vi. 1719–1721, ix. 292.

JOHN OF NEPOMUK: The most popular national saint of Bohemia, considered the protomartyr of the seal of confession and a patron against calumnies and floods. The historical starting-point of the Nepomuk-legend is the person of John of Pomuk or Nepomuk, a city of Bohemia (55 m.

s.w. of Prague). He was born probably about 1340 and studied at the new university in Prague. In 1393 he was made vicar-general of Archbishop John of Jenstein. In the same year, March 20, he became a martyr to the cause of clerical immunity, being thrown into the River Moldau at the behest of King Wenceslaus IV., who was at variance with the clergy, as a penalty for his confirmation, against the king's will, of a new abbot for the Benedictine monastery at Kladrau. Dr. Johanek, as he was called because of his small stature, enjoyed no special reputation; he was rich, possessed houses, and lent money to noblemen and priests. The development and transformation of the legend can be traced through successive stages. The archbishop, who hastened to Rome soon after the crime, in his charge against Wenceslaus, called the victim a martyr; in the biography written a few years later miracles are already recorded by which the drowned man was discovered. The uncritical Bohemian annalists from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century fostered the fable. About the middle of the fifteenth century the statement appears for the first time that the refusal to violate the seal of confession was the cause of John's death. Two decades later (1471), the dean of Prague, Paul Zidek, makes Johanek the queen's confessor. The unscrupulous chronicler Wenceslaus Hayek, the "Bohemian Livy," speaks in 1541 (probably owing to carelessness in the use of his sources) of two Johns of Nepomuk being drowned; the first as confessor, the second for his confirmation of the abbot. The legend is especially indebted for its growth to the Jesuit Balbinus, the "Bohemian Pliny," whose services to the history of his country were so conspicuous that he was persecuted by the government, which preferred oblivion and silence. He was, however, as credulous as he was patriotic, and even became a forger to honor his saint. Although the Prague metropolitan chapter did not accept the biography dedicated to it, "as being frequently destitute of historical foundation and erroneous, a bungling work of mythological rhetoric," Balbinus stuck to it. In 1683 the Prague bridge was adorned with a statue of the saint, which has had numerous successors; in 1708 the first church was dedicated to him at Königgrätz. Meanwhile, in spite of the objection of the Jesuits, the process was inaugurated which ended with his canonization. On June 25, 1721, he was beatified, and on March 19, 1729, he was canonized under Benedict XIII. The acts of the process, comprising 500 pages, which cost more than 180,000 crowns, distinguish two Johns of Nepomuk and sanction the cultus of the one who was drowned in 1383 as a martyr of the sacrament of penance.

The ingenious suggestion has been made that the historical kernel of St. John Nepomuk is really Huss, who was metamorphosed from a Bohemian Reformer into a Roman-Catholic saint; and that the Nepomuk-legend is a Jesuit blending of the John who was drowned and the John who was burned. The resemblances are certainly striking, extending to the manner of celebrating their commemorations. But when the Jesuits came to Prague, the Nepomuk-worship had long been widespread; and the idea of canonization originated in opposition not to the Hussites, but to Protestantism, as a weapon of the Counter-Reformation—though his cultus was also intended to supplant Huss in the hearts of the Bohemian people. In the image of the saint which gradually arose the religious history of Bohemia is reflected. This much is historically certain, that the Vicar-general John of Pomuk was drowned in 1393 because of the choice of the abbot, and that Rome, making use of a forged biography, has canonized a man whose very existence can not be demonstrated.

Georg Loesche.

Bibliography: The *Vita* by Bohuslav Balbinus is in *ASB*, May, iii, 668–680. The *Acta* leading up to the canonization were published at Verona, 1725, and the *Acta canonizationis* at Rome, 1727. Naturally a large part of the literature on the subject is in Bohemian—for a list consult Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 1400–1401. Consult O. Abel, *Die Legende vom heiligen Johann von Nepomuk*, Berlin, 1855; A. Würfel, *Legende des heiligen Johann von Nepomuk*, Prague, 1862; A. Frind, *Der geschichtliche . . . Johannes von Nepomuk*, Prague, 1871; A. H. Wratislaw, *Life, Legend and Canonization of St. John Nepomucen*, London, 1873; *Die Frage über . . . Johann von Nepomuk*, in *Der Katholik*, i (1882), 273–300, 390–414; T. Schmude, in *ZKT*, vii (1883), 52–123; *KL*, vi. 1725–1742.

Life.

JOHN OF SALISBURY: English ecclesiastic, and bishop of Chartres; b. at Salisbury between 1110 and 1120; d. at Chartres (54 m. s.w. of Paris) Oct. 25, 1180. He was of humble Saxon origin, but in 1136 left his native land to study in France, especially in Paris. Among his teachers there were the famous Abelard, Robert of Melun, and Alberic of Reims. After studying dialectics at Paris for two years, he went to Chartres, where for three years he heard the lectures of William of Conches, and later studied under Richard l'Évêque, Hardewin the German, Theodoric, Peter Elias, and others. He returned to Paris and began the study of theology, his teachers being Gilbert de la Porrée, Robert Pulleyne, and Simon of Poissy. Despite bitter poverty, he spent twelve years in France, passing the latter portion of the time with his intimate friend Peter, abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Moutier la Celle near Troyes, through whom he became acquainted with Bernard of Clairvaux. This powerful head of the Cistercians brought John to the attention of Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury, who had fled from England to escape Stephen. When the archbishop was able to return to his see, John was invited, in 1148 or the beginning of 1149, to act as his chancellor or secretary. He was a firm defender of the spiritual and secular supremacy of the pope and of the independence of the clergy, regarding these principles as the means of protecting mankind against the injustice of the secular arm and the consequences of sin. He sought to carry out his doctrine in practical ecclesiastical life, even though his views that only the Roman Catholic hierarchy could unfold the blessings of Christianity aroused the opposition of the court and of the bishops, the latter regarding themselves as peers of the realm rather than as subject to a distant pope. The increasing age and infirmity of the archbishop brought additional ecclesiastical responsibilities upon John, while he was able to render many important political services to Henry II. after the death of Stephen in 1154. Sent on repeated missions for both prelate and king, he crossed the Alps, according to his own statement, ten times, visiting the Curia during the reign of Pope Eugenius III. and living for three months at Benevento with Adrian IV., with whom he was on terms of personal friendship. His position became difficult, however, after the death of Adrian in 1159, when he took sides with Alexander III. against the antipope Victor IV. He secured the recognition of Alexander in England, but came in conflict with the king and the royalist bishops as the exponent of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. He was deprived of his preferments and emoluments, and was even in peril of his life, so that he contemplated flight from England, but was rehabilitated at the petition of the pope, the archbishop, and Thomas Becket. His power reached its climax when the latter, his close personal friend, succeeded Theobald as archbishop of Canterbury in 1162. Throughout the struggle between the archbishop and the king, John remained the faithful friend of the former, whom he preceded into exile in 1163. When a nominal peace was patched up between the archbishop and Henry in 1170, John returned to England, and, though he was not present at the actual scene of the archbishop's murder, he hastened there soon enough to receive some of the martyr's blood as a relic. A time of peril followed until the papal influence and popular opinion forced the king to change his course. John, who had fled from Canterbury, again received his preferments, and cooperated zealously with Richard of Dover, the successor of Thomas. He was likewise active in the canonization of the murdered prelate. In 1176 he was unanimously chosen bishop of Chartres, and was consecrated in August of the same year. There, however, he was obliged to struggle against all manner of opposition, although he enjoyed the support of the pope, and in 1179 attended the third Lateran Council, where he uttered a solemn warning against unjustifiable innovations and urged the clergy to conform to the Gospel.

Writings.

The most important and comprehensive work of John of Salisbury was his *Policraticus sive de nugis curalium et vestigiis philosophorum*, written in 1159 and dedicated to Thomas Becket. It is a system of ecclesiastical and political economics and ethics based on Christianity and the wisdom of the ancients, and designed to lead from the triviality of secular and court life to a true knowledge and government of the world. In his book the author wove from his wealth of experience both a picture of actual life and the ideal of true Christian living, in which the Church should rule and lead all mankind as the guardian and representative of divine law and true human justice. The *Policraticus*, the first great theory of the State in the Middle Ages, exercised an influence on Thomas Aquinas and Vincent of Beauvais. It was first edited, apparently by the Brethren of the Common Life, at Brussels about 1480. Immediately after the *Policraticus* John wrote the *Metalogicus*, which may be regarded as its continuation; this was also dedicated to Thomas Becket. This work, which is in four books and which was first edited at Paris in 1610, is a presentment of true and false science, in which the author castigates not only contempt of science, especially of logic, but also false and sophistic scholasticism. These aberrations of his contemporaries were compared with the sound views of Plato and the academic school, and especially with Aristotle, whose *Organon* John of Salisbury was the first in western Europe to know and use. His earliest work was his *Entheticus* (*Eutheticus, Nutheticus*), *sive de dogmate philosophorum*, written about 1155, and consisting of a philosophical and satirical poem in 926 distichs, dedicated to Thomas Becket. The first part contains a critical presentation of the basal concepts of the Greek and Roman philosophers, who are unfavorably contrasted with the higher truth of Christianity. The second part exhorts Thomas to consider the plight of the threatened and afflicted Church, and describes the lamentable condition of England. The poem is extant in only two manuscripts, and was first edited by C. Petersen at Hamburg in 1843. John was likewise the author of a *Historia pontificalis*, embracing the years 1148–52 and written about 1165 as a supplement to the chronicle of Sigibert and his immediate successors. The fragment begins with the Council of Reims, which John attended, and breaks off abruptly in the middle of a sentence discussing the events of 1152. The only edition is that by W. Arndt in *MGH*, *Script.*, xx (1868), 515–545.

The minor works of John of Salisbury were his *Vita Sancti Anselmi*, written in 1163 as a supplement to Eadmer's larger biography of Anselm and designed as an aid in the projected canonization of the saint at the Council of Tours, and his *Vita et passio Sancti Thomae*, composed shortly after 1170 as an argument for the canonization of Thomas Becket. His letters, collected by him in four books, although the present collection of 327 is contained in two parts, are of great importance both for his biography and for the ecclesiastical history of his time, since they are addressed to popes (Adrian and Alexander III.), to princes, and to many ecclesiastical and secular potentates. The first edition of J. Masson (Paris, 1611) contained only 302 letters, but others have since been discovered. A number of additional works have been ascribed to this author. Some titles may refer to treatises now lost, while certain others may represent individual chapters of the *Policraticus*. A complete edition of the works of John of Salisbury (not without flaws) was published by J. A. Giles (5 vols. *PEA*, Oxford, 1848) and reprinted in *MPL*, xcix.

(K. Schaarschmidt.)

Bibliography: The best sources of knowledge are his own works, particularly his letters in vol. i. of Giles' edition, ut sup. Two lives are those by H. Reuter, *Johannes von Salisbury*, Berlin, 1842; K. Schaarschmidt, *Johannes Saresbariensis nach Leben und Studien, Schriften und Philosophie*, Leipsic, 1862. Consult further: K. Pauli, in *Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht*, 1881, pp. 265 sqq.; R. L. Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Mediaeval Thought*, chaps. iv.–vii., London, 1884; W. Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of . . . History*, lects. vi.–vii., ib. 1886; P. Gennrich, in *ZKG*, xiii (1893), 544–551; J. H. Overton, *The Church in England*, i. 207, 217, 218, London,

1897; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, xiv. 89–161; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xiv. 675–680; Neander, *Christian Church*, iv. 194–195, 357–358, 415 et passim; *DNB*, xxix. 439–446.

JOHN, SAINT, CHRISTIANS OF. See MANDÆANS.

JOHN, SAINT, FIRE OF (SAINT JOHN'S FIRE): A fire lighted in accord with ancient custom in various countries, especially in southern Germany, on the evening or eve of the day of St. John the Baptist (June 24) in the open air on hills and mountains, or in the streets and villages. It must be needfire, and the ceremonies attending it are the dancing of the young around it, the throwing of all sorts of flowers, herbs, and garlands into it, the priestly blessing of the fire, the kindling and rolling of a wheel wrapped with straw (" St. John's wheel ") the erection of a tree, the driving of cattle through the fire, the carrying of torches and fire-brands, and the like. All manner of healing and beneficent properties are ascribed to the fire, such as protection against sickness, cure of all diseases (especially epilepsy), fertility, exemption from fire and storm, and safety against witchcraft. Although the origin, extension, and significance of these customs are uncertain, it is at least clear that they are survivals of a primitive cult of the light, fire, and sun, current throughout the Indo-Germanic peoples. Parallels are accordingly found not only in the Greco-Roman world, as in the Vesta-cult and the Palilia, but also among the Celts, Germans, and Slavs, though there is no evidence that one people borrowed from another. The festival was obviously a celebration of the summer solstice. The garlands, like the rolling of the wheel and the dancing round the fire, symbolize the sun, but the so-called " solstice-girdle," as the ironwort and wormwood hallowed in ancient custom are called, represent the girdle bound about his loins by the Apostle John lest he should become weary in his wanderings. The fire of St. John celebrates the solstice, the time when the days are longest, and also the time when the bloom of spring passes over to the harvest. At that period the heat of summer threatens sickness, so that the blessings of fertility must be assured, and all impending danger be averted. It is the time when lost treasures rise and are exposed to the light of the sun, and spirits seeking release wander about. All plants then develop especially healing properties, and water is then particularly good both for bathing and drinking. This is explained by the ancient Germanic belief in Baldur, the god of light, whose place is here taken by John the Baptist. The fire of St. John thus represents victory of light over darkness, the shortest night of the year, on which in the far north the sun does not set, being transformed into day by the fires. The Church was fully conscious of the relation of the feast of St. John to the summer solstice, and endeavored to suppress the custom of kindling fires; but it was forced to yield to popular usage, so that finally the fire was not only tolerated, but the clergy and the nobility took part in the celebration. Attempts were made at an early time, however, to give the fire of St. John a Christian interpretation, and medieval theologians of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries interpreted it with reference to John i. 8. Others sought to explain the fire from the legend of the burning of the Baptist's bones at Sebaste, while the dance was supposed to be a reminiscence of the dance of the daughter of Herodias, all efforts being made to avoid any allusion to paganism. In many places, especially in Evangelical countries, the fires of St. John have been forbidden in modern times, or have become obsolescent of themselves. (A. FREYBE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. M. Paciandi, *De cultu S. Joannis Baptistae antiquitates Christianae*, Rome, 1758; C. F. de Khautz, *De ritu ignis in natali S. Johannis accensi*, Vienna, 1759; Ersch and Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, section II., vol. xxii., p. 265; F. Nork, *Festkalender*, pp. 406 sqq., Stuttgart, 1847; J. Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, p. 578 sqq., Göttingen, 1854; R. Chambers, *Book of Days*, under June 24, 2 vols., London, 1862–64.

JOHN, SAINT, OF BEVERLEY: Bishop of Hexham and of York; d. at Beverley (27 m. e.s.e. of York) May 7, 721. He was born in Northumbria of noble parentage, studied at Canterbury under Archbishop Theodore, and was an inmate of Hilda's monastery at Streanæshalch (Whitby). In 687 he became bishop of Hexham, and on the death of Bosa in 705 was transferred to York. He established a convent at Beverley, and in 718 gave up his bishopric and retired thither. He was eloquent, learned, and holy, a founder of schools, and a famous teacher. Bede was ordained by him and may have been his scholar. After St. Cuthbert, he was the greatest of the North English saints and the miracles related of him rival those of Cuthbert and Aidan. Henry V. attributed the victory at Agincourt to his intercession, the battle being fought on his day.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The fundamental source is Bede, *Hist. eccl.*, iv. 23, v. 2–6, 24. Consult also: *Fasti Eboracenses*, ed. W. H. Dixon and J. Raine, i. 84–92, London, 1883; J. Raine, *The Historians of the Church of York*, i., pp. lii.–lx., 239–348, 511–541 (no. 71 of *Rolls Series*, ib. 1879); W. Bright, *Early English Church Hist.*, pp. 398–399, Oxford, 1897; *DNB*, xxix. 435–436; *DCB*, iii. 377–378.

JOHN, SAINT, ORDER OF HOSPITALERS OF: One of the most famous of the so-called military orders of the Middle Ages (see MILITARY RELIGIOUS ORDERS). They are known by various names: the Knights Hospitalers of St. John of Jerusalem, *Milites hospitalis S. Joannis Hierosolymitani*, *Johannitae*, etc.; later, from their chief seats, Knights of Rhodes and Knights of Malta. The origin of the order is obscure, but it was evidently based on an older foundation, a "hospital of Jerusalem," which seems to have been an independent establishment of the citizens of Amalfi. Previous to the capture of Jerusalem by the Crusaders (1099) the rector of the hospital was a Brother Gerhard (or Gerald; in later time the name Tunc or Tonque was added), who enlarged the institution after the city was taken and reorganized it. With the cooperation of the Crusaders the hospital increased in importance, and Gerhard may thus be regarded as the founder of the Hospitalers of St. John. He was succeeded by Raymund du Puy, who gave the brothers a rule which was approved by Innocent II., Eugene III.,

Origin and Development into a Military Order.

and Lucius III., and in 1287–90 William of Stefano made the first collection of statutes; a second was made in 1303 and these two collections formed the basis of all subsequent ones. At first all members wore a black robe with a cross of eight points of white linen affixed to it, worn on the left breast. In 1259 Alexander IV. granted to members of the first class a red mantle with a white cross.

In hospital service the order was most active; its institutions were models for the age, and its rules and regulations formed the patterns for the other orders of Hospitalers (q.v.). The chief hospital at Jerusalem was built opposite the Holy Sepulcher and was a large structure with wide colonnades, in which hundreds of pilgrims and invalids found welcome and assistance. This institution continued its activity even after the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin, while the order supported hospitals in numerous other places, particularly in Acre, Cyprus, Rhodes, and Malta. Skilled physicians were soon found in the hospitals, and all clothing, food, wine, and other necessities for the sick were furnished by the various houses. Gradually, however, as the struggle against the infidels claimed every energy, the knights were released from the care of the sick, and complaints were soon heard, especially in the East, that invalids were neglected by many houses. The order became more and more knightly, and steadily lost its monastic character, whereas originally the monks had almost outnumbered the knights in the membership of the order. With surprising rapidity valuable possessions and privileges were acquired both in the Orient and in the Occident. In Palestine the castles of the knights stretched from north to south, especially along the threatened frontier from Hebron to Ascalon, on the eastern shore of Lake Tiberias, and in the vicinity of Tripolis and Antioch. The seat of the grand master, after the fall of Jerusalem, was the citadel of Margat, which was supposed to be impregnable, until it was taken by Sultan Kalaun in 1285, Acre, the last possession of the knights in Palestine, being captured six years later.

The Knights in Rhodes and Malta.

A scanty remnant of the order fled to Cyprus, where the king provided them a refuge in the city of Limisso. In 1309, so speedy was its revival, the Grand Master Foulques de Villaret captured the island of Rhodes and founded a kingdom which lasted for two centuries, was a bulwark of Europe against the Turks, and only fell through treachery in 1522. This was the period of the order's great prosperity. Its wealth was increased by the greater portion of the estates of the Knights Templars (q.v.) after their suppression in 1311, and the income of the Knights of St. John was at least 36,000,000 francs annually, eighteen or twenty times that of the king of France. The order was divided into eight "languages," Provence (always considered the first), Auvergne, France, Italy, Aragon, England, Germany, and Castile. Each "language" was subdivided into grand priories and these into commanderies, the latter visited periodically by the grand prior. At the head of the entire order stood the grand master, aided by the chapter-general which convened at stated intervals and had legislative power.

After the loss of Rhodes the knights had no home until 1530, when Charles V. gave them the island of Malta (whence the name "Knights of Malta"), which they defended courageously against the Turks. With the grand-mastership of Jean de la Valette (1557–68) the order reached its climax, but the Reformation brought them one disaster after another, while internal dissension added to the calamities, and the knights became mere protectors of merchantmen against pirates. Under the Grand Master Ferdinand von Hompesch, the island was betrayed to Bonaparte and on Sept. 4, 1800, it was seized by the English. The order was suppressed in Bavaria and Spain, while Paul I. of Russia, who had been elected grand master in place of Von Hompesch, was not recognized by the pope. The Roman Catholic remnants were collected under the administration of a grand master who is appointed by the pope and who has resided in Rome since 1834.

Modern Affiliations.

In Prussia the commandery of Brandenburg preserved its existence as the Protestant part of the order, although its property was confiscated in 1810 and it became a meaningless decoration. In 1852, however, it was reorganized by Frederick William IV., and has since been extremely active as a hospital order. It has founded some fifty hospitals, including one established at Beirut during the persecutions of the Christians by the Druses of Lebanon in 1860. In the wars of 1864, 1866, and 1870 the Hospitalers gave invaluable aid to the sick and wounded. In like manner the Roman-Catholic Hospitalers, called distinctively Knights of Malta, have revived the original functions of the order, at least in Germany. (G. UHLHORN†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A very complete review of the literature of the subject is given by F. de Hellwald, *Bibliographie méthodique de l'ordre . . . de St. Jean de Jerusalem*, Rome, 1885. The sources are collected in *Codice diplom-del sacro militare ordine Gerosolimitano*, Lucca, 1733, and in the great work begun by J. Delaville de Roulx, *Cartulaire générale de l'ordre des hospitaliers S. Jean de Jerusalem*, of which 2 vols. have so far appeared, Paris, 1894 sqq., with which cf. the same author's *De prima origine hospitaliorum Hierosolymitarum*, Paris, 1885, and his *Les Statuts de l'ordre . . .*, in *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, xviii., pp. 341–356. Consult: R. Aubert de Verto; d'Aubeuf, *Hist. des chevaliers hospitaliers*, Paris, 1726; A. von Winterfeld, *Geschichte des ritterlichen Ordens St. Johannis vom Spital zu Jerusalem*, Berlin, 1859; M. J. J. G. Saige, *De l'anciénnité de l'hôpital St. Jean de Jerusalem*, in *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, 1863, p. 552; H. von Ortenburg, *Der Ritterorden des heiligen Johannes von Jerusalem*, Regensburg, 1866; J. Wilson, *Concise Account of St. John's Gate, Clerkenwell, and of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem*, London, 1869; F. C. Woodhouse, *The Military Religious Orders of the Middle Ages*, New York, 1879; A. T. Drane, *The Knights of St. John*, London, 1881; W. K. R. Bedford, *The Regulations of the Old Hospital of the Knights of St. John at Valetta*, ib. 1882; G. Uhlhorn, in *ZKG*, vi (1882), 46; H. Prutz, *Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge*, pp. 235 sqq., Berlin, 1883; F. von Finck, *Uebersicht über die Geschichte des ritterlichen Ordens St. Johannis*, Berlin, 1890; C. Herrlich, *Die Balley Brandenburgh des Johanniterordens*, ib. 1891; J. von Pflug-Hartung, *Die Anfänge des Johanniterordens in Deutschland*, ib. 1899; Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, iii. 72 sqq.; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*; *KL*, vi. 1791–1803; S. F. A. Caulfield, *Dawn of Christianity in Modern Europe . . . Knights of the Hospital . . .*, London, 1909.

JOHN THE STEADFAST: Elector of Saxony 1525–32, brother of Frederick the Wise (q.v.); b. at Meissen (15 m. n.w. of Dresden) June 30, 1468; d. at Schweinitz (54 m. n.e. of Merseburg) Aug. 16, 1532. He received a scholarly education, was trained in the arts of knighthood, and is said to have distinguished himself in the struggle against the Turks. Luther's writings soon won his heart, and he followed the development of the reformatory movement with ever increasing interest. It was he who, in the absence of the elector, omitted to publish the bull directed against Luther. In his letters to his brother he warmly recommended Luther and admonished the cautious elector to adopt more decidedly the reformer's cause and to influence other princes in the same direction. His influence decided Frederick to protect Luther in the Wartburg. During the printing of his New Testament, Luther sent John the single sheets, and thenceforth he read the Bible daily. In October, 1522, Luther came for the first time, as it seems, on his journey to Erfurt to the court of Weimar and preached several times. His sermons on the limitations of secular authority caused John to desire further discussion of the subject, and Luther published his treatise *Von weltlicher Obrigkeit*, the principles of which John conscientiously tried to carry out throughout his life. Too one-sided emphasis of these principles and his anxiety not to interfere improperly in spiritual matters, seem to have been the reason why he tolerated for a long time the agitation of Münzer and Carlstadt. Similarly he did not interfere with the abolition of the Corpus Christi procession, and allowed the reading of the mass and the celebration of the Lord's Supper after the Protestant fashion.

When he became sole ruler, after the death of Frederick (May 5, 1525), he announced to the clergy that in future the pure word of God should be preached without human addition, and that all useless ceremonies should be abolished. He resolutely refused an agreement with his cousin, George of Saxony, and with the landgrave of Hesse openly confessed the Evangelical doctrine. To be prepared against machinations of his opponents, a treaty was ratified Feb. 27, 1526, between him and Philip of Hesse, which was soon joined by other Evangelical estates, so that John became the leader of the Evangelical party. As such he appeared at the Diet of Speyer in 1526 (see SPEYER, DIETS OF). Difficult problems awaited him at home. Before he had become elector, Nicolaus Hausman, preacher of Zwickau, had called his attention to the miserable condition of the Church and advised him to undertake a general visitation, pointing to Luther as the most suitable man for that purpose. Luther now proposed to institute four or five commissions of visitation for the whole country, and there followed a demand of the visitators that the privilege to install or depose clergymen should belong exclusively to the sovereign. It was a step in the development of the State Church, and the acknowledgment of the secular ruler as the protector of the Church.

Owing to the influence of Luther, John reorganized the University of Wittenberg and checked the greed of the nobility in appropriating the possessions of the Church, which had become a real danger for the country. During this constructive activity of the elector the rumor spread of the formation of a league of Roman Catholic princes at Breslau (1528) for the annihilation of the Evangelical estates and the extirpation of the new heresy. Otto von Pack reported to Landgrave Philip of Hesse that he and the elector were required to reestablish the Roman religion in their countries. Both were convinced of the genuineness of the report and prepared for defense by trying to gain new allies in the north and south. At the advice of Luther and contrary to the wish of Philip, John desisted from assuming the offensive. In full confidence of the justice of his cause he went again to the Diet of Speyer in 1529, and, by openly avowing his Evangelical convictions, incurred the enmity of the majority. He defended the Evangelical interpretation of the Recess of Speyer of 1526, according to which the privilege of ecclesiastical renovation had been granted, and protested against the resolution of the majority, which threatened the further existence of the new Church. At first he was inclined to meet the efforts of the Strasburg Evangelicals who tried to unite the Protestants on the question of the Lord's Supper, but Luther dissuaded him. His acceptance of the Schwabach Article (q.v.), drawn up by Luther, showed his determination to renounce even his league with the landgrave, if the latter would not separate himself from the union efforts of Switzerland and Upper Germany. Although he had sustained many an insult from the emperor, he acknowledged obedience to him, except where it conflicted with the honor of God and his soul's welfare. At the Diet of Augsburg, in 1530, his conduct was heroic. He firmly maintained his Evangelical position, and refused to forbid Evangelical preaching at the demand of the emperor. The great services he rendered to the final success of the Augsburg Confession are well known. On his homeward journey he learned of the warlike preparations of his enemies, but his interpretation of the Word of God withheld him from opposing an attack of his emperor. After some weeks, however, he, as well as Luther, was convinced by jurists that the relation of the emperor to the estates was not strictly monarchical, both parties being bound by law and right, and that the emperor, in attacking the Evangelicals, acted not only against God, but against his own imperial rights; therefore a defense of the Evangelicals would be justified, and in 1531 the Protestants formed a defensive league under the leadership of John. On the question of the election of Ferdinand as Roman king, he took a much firmer stand. At the beginning of the Diet of Augsburg he had been determined to oppose it for legal reasons, and what he heard later of the practises of the emperor and Ferdinand confirmed him in his opposition. Luther advised him, though hesitatingly, to concede the election, but in this point John followed his chancellor, Brück, who asked him to protest against it. The elector was declared disobedient because he did not appear personally at the election, and thus the rupture between him and the emperor was decided. Political conditions, however, forced the emperor again to approach the Evangelical estates, and on July 23, 1532, the religious peace of Nuremberg (see NUREMBERG, RELIGIOUS PEACE OF) was ratified. John had not the gifts of statesmanship which his brother Frederick possessed, but he was a man of fearless courage, deep Evangelical convictions, and unsullied life. (T. KOLDE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: Spalatin's *Biographie*, in J. B. Mencke, *Conspectus script. rer. Germ.*, ii. 1123 sqq., Leipsic, 1728; C. E. Förstemann, *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte des Reichstags zu Augsburg*, 2 vols., Halle, 1833–35; idem, *Archiv für die Geschichte der kirchlichen Reformation*, i., part 1, ib. 1833; idem, *Neues Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der . . . Kirchen-Reformation*, vol. i., Hamburg, 1842; C. G. Neudecker, *Aktenstücke aus dem Zeitalter der Reformation*, Nuremberg, 1839–40; and the various editions of Luther's correspondence. C. A. H. Burckhardt, *Geschichte der sächsischen Kirchen- und Schulvisitationen*, Leipsic, 1879; H. Schwarz, *Landgraf Philipp von Hessen und die Packischen-Händel*, Leipsic, 1884; O. Winckelmann, *Der schmalkaldische Bund und der Marburger Religionsfriede*, Strasburg, 1892; L. von Ranke, *Deutsche Geschichte*, vols. iii.–iv., Leipsic, 1894; *Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 233–276, New York, 1904; and the literature under LUTHER; REFORMATION.

JOHN OF THESSALONICA: Archbishop of Thessalonica. He was delegate of the pope at the sixth ecumenical council (Constantinople, 680). In the proceedings of the second synod held at Nicæa (Mansi, xiii. 164) occurs a fragment of his dialogue between a Christian and a pagan, in which image-worship is justified. Image-worship, he says, relates to the saints and not to the pictures, to God as he used to walk among men; even the angels have a certain corporeality. There has also been handed down a speech of John entitled "On the death of the most holy . . . mother of God and ever virgin Mary." It is complete only in an old Slavonic translation (in Popov, *Bibliografičeskija materialy*, pp. 40–65, Moscow, 1879); fragments of the original are in Tischendorf, *Apocalypses apocryphae* (Leipsic, 1866). The speech follows closely the *De dormitione Mariae* of Pseudo-John and has been ascribed to him. There is also extant a writing entitled "On the glorious, victorious Demetrius" (*ASB.*, Oct., iv. 104–160) which bears the name of John of Thessalonica.

(N. BONWETSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Leo Allatius, *De Symeonum scriptis*, pp. 105, 110, Paris, 1664; M. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, ii. 42, 3 vols., Paris, 1740; W. Cave, *Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum historia literaria*, i. 597, Oxford, 1740; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, x. 219, 250, 285, Hamburg, 1807; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, p. 192; *DCB*, iii. 396.

JOHN-BONITES: An order of hermits, founded by Giovanni Buono (b. at Mantua 1168; d. Oct. 23, 1249), who, after long years as a strolling jongleur, was converted in 1208. Retiring to a lonely spot near the church of Santa Maria di Budriolo, not far from Cesena, he is said to have lived first as an absolute hermit, but about 1217 began to gather companions around him. Although he never took orders, and could neither read nor write, the fame of his extraordinary mortifications wrought marvellous conversions, both among his immediate followers and among the heretical Lombard Patarenes, many of whom he restored to the Church. Without formulating a written rule, or even a definite mode of life, for his spiritual children, communities of hermits are said to have originated in his own lifetime, located at Bertinoro (near Forli), Mantua, Venice, Bologna, Parma, Ferrara, Poggiolo, Faenza, Poncelia, and Rimini. A few years before Buono's death, the John-Bonites (*Johannbonitae, Jambonitae*), whom their founder had vested with a gray habit, were bound by Innocent IV. to the Augustinian rule. Alexander IV., by bull of Aug. 13, 1256, forced them to enter his newly founded order of Augustinian hermits, thus terminating their independent existence. The efforts to canonize Giovanni Buono, originating chiefly from Mantua and begun as early as the middle of the thirteenth century, resulted only in his beatification by Sixtus IV. in 1483; nevertheless, he is the chief patron of Mantua, where his remains have reposed in the church of Santa Agnese Nuova since 1451. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Vita* of the founder, by A. Calepino, with commentary, is in *ASB*, Oct., ix. 693–886; Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, iii. 8 sqq.

JOHNS, CLAUDE HERMANN WALTER: Church of England; b. at Banwell (22 m. s.w. of Bath), Somersetshire, Feb. 20, 1857. He was educated at Queen's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1880), and was second master successively at Horton College, Tasmania, in 1880–84 and Paston Grammar School, North Walsham, Norfolk, in 1884–86. He was ordered deacon in 1887 and ordained priest in the following year, and from 1887 until 1892 was tutor in St. Peter's Training College for Schoolmasters, Peterborough, as well as curate of St. Botolph's, Helpston (1887–88), and of St. John's, Peterborough (1888–91). Since 1892 he has been rector of St. Botolph's, Cambridge. He was also chaplain of Queen's College from 1893 to 1901, and since 1897 has been lecturer in Assyriology in Cambridge University, as well as in King's College, London, since 1902. He has likewise been Edwards fellow in the former university since 1900, and was honorary secretary of the Cambridge Pupil Teachers' Centre in 1894–1900. In theology he is a moderate Anglican. He has written *Assyrian Deeds and Documents* (3 vols., Cambridge, 1898–1902); *An Assyrian Doomsday-Book, or Liber Censualis of the District round Harran* (Leipsic, 1901); *The Oldest Code of Laws in the World, Promulgated by Hammurabi* (Edinburgh, 1903); and *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts, and Letters* (New York, 1904).

JOHNS, JOHN: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Virginia; b. at New Castle, Del., July 10, 1796; d. at Alexandria, Va., Apr. 5, 1876. He studied at Princeton (B.A., 1815), and subsequently spent two years in the theological seminary there. In both college and seminary he was a classmate of Charles Hodge, with whom he formed a lifelong intimacy. He was ordained deacon in 1819, and priest in 1820. His first parish was All Saints, Frederick, Md., where he remained till 1829, when he became rector of Christ Church, Baltimore. This charge he held till he was elected assistant bishop of Virginia in 1842. He became bishop in 1862. He was for a number of years the head of the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary of

Virginia. He wrote *A Memoir of the Life of the Right Rev. William Meade* (Baltimore, 1867).

Bibliography: W. S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 87, New York, 1895.

JOHNSON, ELIAS HENRY: Baptist; b. at Troy, N. Y., Oct. 15, 1841; d. at Chester, Pa., Mar. 10, 1906. He was educated at the University of Rochester (A.B., 1862), and from 1862 to 1864 continued his studies, a part of the time at Rochester Theological Seminary. After being acting assistant paymaster in the United States Navy in 1864–1866, he entered the Baptist ministry in the latter year, holding a pastorate at Le Sueur, Minn., in 1866–68. He then reentered Rochester Theological Seminary, from which he was graduated in 1871, spent two years in travel in Europe, the Holy Land, and Egypt, after which he was pastor at Ballston, N. Y., from 1873 to 1875 and at Providence, R. I., from 1875 to 1883. From the latter year until his death he was professor of systematic theology at Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa. He edited *Songs of Praise for Sunday Schools* (Philadelphia, 1882); *Our Sunday School Songs* (1885); and the hymnal *Sursum Corda* (1898); besides being associate editor of *The Baptist Hymnal* (Philadelphia, 1883). He also wrote *Uses and Abuses of Ordinances* (Philadelphia, 1890); *Outline of Systematic Theology* (1892); *Review of Ethical Monism* (New York, 1895); *Ezekiel Gilman Robinson* (1896); *Religious Use of Imagination* (1900); *The Highest Life* (1901); *The Holy Spirit Then and Now* (Philadelphia, 1904); and the posthumous *Christian Agnosticism as Related to Christian Knowledge, ed. with Biographical Sketch,* H. C. Vedder (1907).

JOHNSON, FRANCIS: English Separatist; b. at Richmond (42 m. n.w. of York), Yorkshire, 1562; d. at Amsterdam Jan. 10, 1618. He studied at Christ's College, Cambridge (B. A., 1581), and became fellow. In 1589 he was expelled from the university for preaching in favor of Presbyterian polity, went to Zealand, and became minister of the English Church at Middelburg. In 1591 he was instrumental in destroying the entire edition of a book by Barrow and Greenwood (*A Plain Refutation of M. Giffard's Book Entitled "A Short Treatise against the Donatists of England": wherein is discovered: (1) the forgery of the whole ministry; (2) the confusion; (3) false worship;* and *(4) antichristian disorder of those parish assemblies called the Church of England;* reprinted Amsterdam, 1605), saving, however, two copies for his own use, and by reading them was converted. In 1592, with Greenwood, he organized a congregation in London and was imprisoned in consequence; in 1597 he settled in Amsterdam and became minister of the Separatists living there; because of disagreement with Henry Ainsworth concerning the authority of elders he went to Emden about 1612, but later returned to Amsterdam. He wrote several controversial treatises.

Bibliography: D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, ii. 40–41, London, 1822; B. Brooke, *Lives of the Puritans*, i. 396–397, ii. 89–90, ib. 1813; H. M. Dexter, *Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years*, New York, 1880; W. Walker, *Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, p. 41, n. 4, New York, 1893; *DNB*, xxx. 9–11.

JOHNSON, FRANKLIN: Baptist; b. at Frankfort, O., Nov. 2, 1836. He was educated at Colgate University, but left before taking his degree, and at Colgate Theological Seminary, from which he was graduated in 1861. He held successive pastorates at the First Baptist Church, Bay City, Mich. (1862–64), Lambertville, N. J. (1864–66), Passaic, N. J. (1866–72), and the Old Cambridge Baptist Church, Cambridge, Mass. (1872–88), interrupted only by a year of study in Germany and travel in Egypt and Palestine in 1868–69. He was president of Ottawa University in 1890–92, and since the latter year has been professor of church history and homiletics in the University of Chicago. In addition to being associate editor of *The Watchman* in 1876, his writings include: *The Gospel According to Matthew, with Notes* (New York, 1873); *Moses and Israel* (1874); *Heroes and Judges from the Law-Givers to the King* (1875); *The Dies Irae* (Cambridge, Mass., 1880); *The Stabat Mater Dolorosa and the Stabat Mater Speciosa* (Boston, 1886); *The New Psychic Studies in their Relation to Christian Thought* (New York, 1886); *The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old Considered in the Light of General Literature* (Philadelphia, 1896); *The Home Missionaries* (Chicago, 1889); *Have We the Likeness of Christ?* (1902); and *The Christian's Relation to Evolution* (1904).

JOHNSON, FREDERICK FOOTE: Protestant Episcopal bishop coadjutor of South Dakota; b. at Newtown, Conn., Apr. 23, 1866. He was graduated at Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., in 1894, and at Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn., in 1897. After being minister at Glenwood Springs, Col., 1896–97, and curate of St. Stephen's, Colorado Springs, 1897–99, he was rector of Trinity, Redlands, Cal., 1899–1904. He was then diocesan missionary in Western Massachusetts for a year, and in 1905 was consecrated bishop coadjutor of South Dakota.

JOHNSON, GISLE CHRISTIAN: Norwegian theologian; b. at Fredrikshald (58 m. s.s.e. of Christiania) Sept. 10, 1822; d. at Christiania July 17, 1894. He was educated at the cathedral school of Christiansand and at the University of Christiania, after which a scholarship enabled him to travel and study in Berlin, Leipsic, Erlangen, Heidelberg, Tübingen, and Paris. He returned to Norway in the fall of 1847, and was appointed lecturer in theology at the university two years later, becoming professor in 1860. He lectured on systematic theology, history of doctrine, theological encyclopedia, and, after 1877, on church history.

Johnson exercised an important influence on Christian life in general as well as on his students by his devotional lectures in Christiania and elsewhere. He spent many of his vacations in traveling through the country in search of health, and in these travels, which were generally on foot, he visited awakened Christian laymen. His theological standpoint was strict orthodoxy of the old Lutheran type, and he worked for the home missions in Christiania, the Norwegian Luther-foundation, the students' home, and similar institutions. Despite his thorough learning, he was not a prolific author, for his rigid self-criticism made him too timid, but when, in 1857, the pietistic preacher G. A. Lammers, of Skien, left the established Church and undertook to found a "free apostolic and Christian congregation," abolishing, among other things, infant baptism, Johnson published his *Nogle Ord om Barnedaaben.* He also collaborated with C. P. Caspari in translating the Old Testament until 1890, and with F. W. Bugge in making a version of the New Testament. With Caspari, furthermore, he edited *Tidsskrift for den evangelisklutherske kirke i Norge.* In 1863 he founded the *Luthersk Kirketidende,* which he edited till 1875, and to which he contributed many articles. In 1878–79 he published his *Grundrids af den systematiske Theologie,* while his *Forelæsninger over den christelige Ethik* and *Forelæsninger over Dogmehistorien* appeared posthumously in 1896. J. Belsheim†.

JOHNSON, HERRICK: Presbyterian; b. at Kaughnewaga, N. Y., Sept. 22, 1832. He was graduated at Hamilton College in 1857 and at Auburn Theological Seminary in 1860. After being associate pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Troy, N. Y., in 1860–62, he was pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church, Pittsburg, Pa., in 1862–67 and the First Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, in 1868–73. He was then professor of homiletics and pastoral theology in Auburn Theological Seminary from 1874 to 1880, after which he was pastor of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Chicago, until 1883. He taught sacred rhetoric and pastoral theology in McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, 1880–1906. He was president of the Presbyterian Board of Ministerial Education in 1869–73 and of the Presbyterian Board of Aid for Colleges and Academies in 1883–1903, moderator of the General Assembly at Springfield, Ill., in 1882, and a member of the Presbyterian Board of Publication in 1868–73, and of two committees of the Presbyterian Church for the revision of the Confession of Faith in 1890 and 1900. In theology he is a liberal conservative, describing himself as "a thorough believer in both the doctrines and polity of the Presbyterian Church, as warranted by the Word of God and represented in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith and form of government." He has written: *Christianity's Challenge* (Chicago, 1880); *Plain Talks about the Theatre* (1882); *Revivals, their Place and Power* (1883); *Presbyterian Bulwarks* (New York, 1887); *Presbyterian Book of Forms* (Philadelphia, 1889); *From Love to Praise* (1903); and *Ideal Ministry* (1908).

JOHNSON, JOSEPH HORSFALL: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Los Angeles; b. at Schenectady, N. Y., June 7, 1847. He was educated at Williams College (A.B., 1870) and General Theological Seminary, from which he was graduated in 1873. He was ordered deacon in the same year and advanced to the priesthood in 1874. He was minister, curate, and rector of Holy Trinity, Highland, N. Y., in 1873–79, and rector of Trinity, Bristol, R. I., in 1879–81, St. Peter's, Westchester, N. Y., in 1881–86, and Christ Church, Detroit, Mich., in 1886–96. In the latter year he was consecrated bishop of Los Angeles.

JOHNSON, SAMUEL: 1. First president of King's College, now Columbia University; b. at Guilford, Conn., Oct. 14, 1696; d. at Stratford, Conn., Jan. 6, 1772. He studied at Yale College (M.A., 1714), and became a tutor there in 1716, on the removal of the college from Saybrook to New Haven. He was ordained pastor of a Congregational church at West Haven in 1720, but became a convert to episcopacy in 1722, and was reordained in England in 1723. On his return to Connecticut he was assigned to the mission at Stratford, where he remained till 1754. Thereupon he was president of King's College, New York, till 1763, when he resigned this position and returned to Stratford. In 1764 he was reappointed to his old charge, which he retained till his death. He formed a close friendship with Bishop George Berkeley (q.v.) during the latter's visit to America, and accepted his teaching. For many years his pen was particularly active in the defense of episcopacy, an unpopular cause in the colonies, and his adoption of it created a profound sensation. He engaged in long controversies with Jonathan Dickinson, Thomas Foxcroft, and John Graham. His principal works are: *A Letter from a Minister of the Church of England to his Dissenting Parishioners* (New York, 1733); *A Second Letter* (Boston, 1734); *A Third Letter* (1737); *A System of Morality* (1746; 3d ed., London, 1754), which was published by Benjamin Franklin under the title *Elementa Philosophica* (Philadelphia, 1752); and *An English and Hebrew Grammar* (London, 1767).

Bibliography: T. B. Chandler, *The Life of S. Johnson . . . First President of King's College,* New York, 1805; W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit,* v. 52–61, ib. 1859; I. W. Riley, *American Philosophy; the Early Schools,* pp. 63–126, New York, 1907.

2. Independent clergyman and reformer; b. at Salem, Mass., Oct. 10, 1822; d. at North Andover, Mass., Feb. 19, 1882. He was graduated from Harvard in 1842 and from the Harvard Divinity School in 1846. He entered the ministry without ordination and never associated himself with any denomination, though in his views he was closely related to the Unitarians. His first charge was the Unitarian Church at Dorchester, where he remained one year. From 1851 till 1870 he was pastor of the Free Church at Lynn. He took a prominent part in the antislavery agitation. His principal publications are: *A Book of Hymns* (Boston, 1846), in collaboration with Samuel Longfellow; *The Worship of Jesus* (1868); and *Oriental Religions, and their Relation to Universal Religion: India* (1872), *China* (1877), *Persia* (1885). Samuel Longfellow collected his *Lectures, Essays, and Sermons* (1883), to which he prefixed a *Memoir.*

JOHNSON, THOMAS CARY: Presbyterian; b. at Fishbok Hill, Va., July 19, 1859. He was educated at Hampden-Sidney College (B.A., 1881), the University of Virginia (1883–84), Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va. (graduated in 1887), and the Yale Divinity School (1887–88). After being professor of Old- and New-Testament exegesis in Austin Theological School, Austin, Tex., in 1888–90, and pastor elect of the Third Presbyterian Church, Louisville, Ky., in 1890–91, he was appointed professor of the English Bible and pastoral theology in Union Theological Seminary, Richmond. In the following year (1892) he was appointed to his present position of professor of ecclesiastical history and polity in the same institution. Besides editing the collected writings of Rev. Prof. T. E. Peck (Richmond, Va., 1885–87), he has written: *The Life and Letters of Robert Lewis Dabney* (Richmond, 1893); *History of the Southern Presbyterian Church* (New York, 1894); *John Calvin and the Genevan Reformation* (Richmond, 1900); *Life and Letters of Benjamin Morgan Palmer* (1906); and *Virginia Presbyterianism and Religious Liberty in Colonial and Revolutionary Times* (1907).

JOHNSON, WILLIAM ALLEN: Protestant Episcopalian; b. at Hyde Park, N. Y., Aug. 4, 1833. He was educated at Columbia (A.B., 1853) and at the General Theological Seminary, from which he was graduated in 1857. He was ordered deacon in 1857 and ordained priest in 1858. He was minister and rector of St. Peter's, Bainbridge, N. Y., and of Christ Church, Guilford, N. Y., from 1857 to 1862, after which he was a missionary in upper Michigan for two years (1862–64). From 1864 to 1870 he was rector of St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J., and from 1871 to 1883 of St. John's, Salisbury, Conn. From the latter year until his retirement as professor emeritus in 1900 he was connected with the Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn., where he was successively professor of homiletics and Christian evidences from 1883 to 1886 and of ecclesiastical history from 1887 to 1900.

JOHNSTON, HOWARD AGNEW: Presbyterian; b. near Xenia, O., June 29, 1860. He was educated at the University of Cincinnati (B.A., 1882) and Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, from which he was graduated in 1885. He was pastor successively of the Seventh Presbyterian Church, Cincinnati, in 1884–90, Central Church, Des Moines, Ia., in 1890–93; Forty-First Street Presbyterian Church, Chicago, in 1893–99; and Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City, in 1899–1905. In the latter year he resigned to be for a couple of years special representative of his denomination to its Asiatic missions, and in 1908 became pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Colorado Springs, Col. He has written *Moses and the Pentateuch* (Cincinnati, 1893); *Studies in God's Methods of Training Workers* (New York, 1900); *Bible Criticism and the Average Man* (Chicago, 1902); *Studies for Personal Workers* (New York, 1903); *Scientific Faith* (Chicago, 1904); *The Beatitudes of Christ* (1905); *Brief Studies through the Bible* (New York, 1905); and *Famine and the Bread* (1908).

JOHNSTON, JAMES STEPTOE: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Western Texas; b. at Church Hill, Miss., June 9, 1843. He was educated at Oakland College, Miss., and the University of Virginia, but left in 1861, before graduation, to enter the Confederate Army. He served throughout the Civil War, first as a private in the Eleventh Mississippi Regiment, and later as a second lieutenant in Stuart's cavalry. After the end of the war, he studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1868. He soon turned, however, from the law to the Church, and, after pursuing his theological studies privately, was ordered deacon in 1869 and priested two years later. He was successively minister and curate at St. James', Port Gibson, Miss., in 1870–1876, and rector of the Church of the Ascension, Mount Sterling, Ky., in 1866–80, and of Trinity, Mobile, Ala., in 1880–88. In the latter year he was consecrated missionary bishop of Western Texas. Within his diocese he has enlarged St. Mary's Hall, a girls' college, and has founded the West Texas Military Academy, both at San Antonio.

JOKTAN, jɵk′tɑn: According to Gen. x. 25 sqq. a son of Eber, the grandson of Shem, brother of Peleg, and father of thirteen sons (twelve according to the LXX). According to this chapter the Semitic stock divided into two branches, a northern and a southern, long before the migrations of the Abrahamic family; and the names of the thirteen sons of Joktan point to southern Arabia, while Genesis is right in distinguishing between the Joktan peoples and the later Ishmaelites. The Arabic ethnographers make the same distinction between the sons of *Ḳaḥṭan* (pure Arabs) and Ishmaelites. The location of the Joktan peoples as given in Gen. x. 30 is disputed. Mesha is placed by Delitzsch on the northwestern corner of the Persian Gulf, and by Knobel about fifty miles southeast of Mecca. In the first case Sephar is placed in the Himyaritic Zaphar in Yemen and the " mountain of the east " is the range in the east of Hadramaut. In the other case, Joktan's possessions were a triangle in southwest Arabia. But neither situation furnishes good locations for Ophir (q.v.) and Havilah (verse 29). See TABLE OF THE NATIONS.

(E. KAUTZSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The commentaries on Genesis and the literature under TABLE OF NATIONS; E. C. A. Riehm, *Handwörterbuch des biblischen Altertums*, pp. 763–764, Leipsic, 1893; *DB*, ii. 743–744; *EB*, ii. 2564; *JE*, vii. 225.

JONAH: Fifth of the Minor Prophets in the arrangement of the English version. He is called the son of Amittai, and, according to II Kings xiv. 25, uttered a prophecy concerning Jeroboam II. The book is distinguished from other prophetical books by the fact that it is not the prophecy, but the personal experiences of the man, in which the interest seems to center. To escape the divine summons to preach repentance to Nineveh, Jonah embarked from Joppa for Tarshish, but during a storm was, at his own advice and by the issue of a lot, thrown overboard, and swallowed by a great fish (i. 17). Three days afterward he was thrown up upon the land, and, after a second summons, began preaching to the Ninevites. When both king and people began to repent, Jonah became indignant at the divine compassion, but was convinced by God of his foolishness through a gourd (iv.). Many have regarded the book as an allegory or a poetic myth, while others hold that it was a national prophetic tradition designed to serve a didactic aim, and contained some elements of historic truth. Those who regard the book as history appeal to the geographical and historical notices in the prophecy; for example, the accuracy of the description of Nineveh and the fitness of Jonah's mission at that particular period, when Israel was coming into contact with Assyria. Those who deny the credibility make much of the abundance of the miraculous, especially of the story of the great fish; but this incident is consistent with our Lord's use of it (Matt. xii. 39 sqq.) to illustrate his own resurrection by the use of material gathered from folk-lore. The central purpose of the book is to teach that the heathen world is called to the knowledge of Yahweh to take its place in his kingdom (iv. 10–11).

That the Jonah of II Kings xiv. 25 has set down in this book his experiences is nowhere indicated. The narrative at beginning and end is so abrupt that it has probably come out of a cycle of narratives like those which center about Elisha; indeed, an old Haggadah calls Jonah a prophet of Elisha's school. There is much difference about the date. Because of the use of the perfect tense in iii. 3b, the book must postdate the fall of Nineveh (606 B.C.); and linguistic indications agree with this, though it should not be brought below the fifth pre-Christian century. Attempts to find Jahvistic and Elohistic sources in the book are not a success.

(W. Volck†.)

Bibliography: Commentaries are: Ephraem Syrus, *The Repentance of Nineveh*, Eng. transl., London, 1853; S. Mitchell, Philadelphia, 1875; M. Kalisch, in *Bible Studies*, part ii., London, 1878 (gives conspectus of earlier literature); A. E. O'Connor, Geneva, 1883; C. H. H. Wright, *Biblical Studies*, Edinburgh, 1886; H. Martin, Edinburgh, 1891; C. von Orelli, Munich, 1896, Eng. transl., New York, 1893; J. Kennedy, London, 1895; W. Nowack, Göttingen, 1897; G. A. Smith, *Book of the Twelve*, vol. ii., London, 1898 (best); F. Hitzig, ed. H. Steiner, Leipsic, 1904; E. B. Pusey, *Minor Prophets*, new issue, London, 1907. Special treatises are: J. Friedrichsen, *Uebersicht über die . . . Ansichten über Jona*, Leipsic, 1841; W. Drake, *Notes on Jonah and Hosea*, London, 1853; T. K. Cheyne, *Theological Review*, 1877, pp. 211–219; K. Vollers, in *ZATW*, iii (1883), 219 sqq., iv (1884), 1 sqq.; W. Böhme, in *ZATW*, vii (1887), 224 sqq. (on the literary composition); A. Merx, *Chrestomathia Targumica*, pp. 132–139, Berlin, 1897 (gives the Targum on Jonah); H. Schmidt, Jona, *Eine Untersuchung zur vergleichenden Religionsgeschicte*, Göttingen, 1907; *DB*, ii. 744–753; *EB*, ii. 2565–2571; *JE*, vii. 225–230.

JONAS OF BOBBIO: Hagiographer of the seventh century; d. after 659. He was a native of Susa (the Roman Segusio), at the foot of Mt. Cenis (about 28 m. w. of Turin). In 618, still quite young, he entered the monastery at Bobbio, and was educated there. He accompanied Bertulf, the third abbot, to Rome in 627. Since he had a personal acquaintance with Eustasius, abbot of Luxeuil, who died in the spring of 629, he may have gone to Gaul (where he remained permanently) as early as 628. While temporarily visiting Bobbio at a later time he promised to write the life of Columban and his successors and disciples, and completed the work between 640 and 643. About this time he was engaged with St. Amandus in trying to convert the heathen Franks on the Scheldt and Scarpe. While staying in Arras he was induced to write the life of St. Vedastes, the first Frankish bishop of Arras, and in Nov., 659, having meanwhile obtained the dignity of abbot, he composed the life of St. John of Reomans. Of the last events of Jonas' life and of his death nothing is known. The *Vita Columbani*, Jonas' principal work, including also, in its second part, Eustasius, Attala, Bertulf, and Burgundofara (in *MPL*, lxxxvii. 1009–46; cf. Krusch in *Mittheilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, xiv. 385 sqq., Innsbruck, 1893; Eng. transl. by D. C. Munro in *Translations and Reprints* published by the department of history of the University of Pennsylvania, ii. 7, Philadelphia, 1895) has established his literary fame. In spite of its silence on important matters —like the Easter controversy and the first application of the rule of St. Benedict in Gaul—notwithstanding the preference for marvelous stories in accordance with the spirit of the times, it rises by a certain historical sense above many like works. The language, too, is peculiar and novel (cf. Krusch, 435), and proves identity of authorship for the *Vita Columbani* and the *Vitae* of Vedastes and St. John of Reomans.

O. Seebass.

Bibliography: *Histoire littéraire de la France*, iii. 604 sqq.; Hertel, in *ZHT*, xxxix. 397 sqq.; Stöber, in *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie*, 1885, pp. 319 sqq.; Krusch, in *Mittheilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, xiv. 385 sqq., and in *MGH*, *Script. rer. Merov.*, iv (1902), 30 sqq.; Wattenbach, *DGQ*, i (1893), 116, 118–119, ii. 503.

JONAS OF ORLÉANS: Bishop of Orléans from 821 till his death in 844. He was a native of Aquitania and succeeded Theodulf (d. Sept. 18, 821) as bishop of Orléans. He attended a synod called at Paris by Louis the Pious in Nov., 825, to consider the question of image-worship, and was sent to Rome to lay the resolutions adopted before Pope Eugenius II. He was also prominent in the synod at Paris in 829, called by the emperor to find remedies for abuses of the time. In 825 Jonas had written on the subject in his *De institutione laicali*, which gives in three books valuable descriptions of the prevalent moral corruption and urges renovation of the churchly spirit. Another topic of the synod's discussion, the duties of secular rulers, had also been anticipated by Jonas in 828 in a little work *De institutione regia*, which now was embodied in the resolutions of the synod. Jonas' remarks on the relation between the spiritual and secular authorities are interesting. The latter are dependent upon the former. The power of the keys has been entrusted to the spiritual office by the Lord so that even kings have to submit to it. Man can not judge God; and therefore he can not judge the representatives of God (ecclesiastics). Louis again addressed himself to Jonas when the energetic measures of Claudius of Turin (q.v.) against image-worship became known in the Frankish realm; and sent him an excerpt from the doctrinal works of Claudius with the request to refute them. The death of Claudius induced Jonas to withhold his refutation at the time. But about 842 he laid his work before Charles the Bald, the son of Louis. Jonas still labored under the superstition of his time. He distinguishes a double adoration—one that is due to God alone, and one that is addressed to the holy images; he advocates the worship of martyrs and relics, believes in an effective intercession of the saints and the mother of God, and demands worship of the cross.

(Albert Freystedt†.)

Bibliography: His works are in *MPL*, cvi.; also partly in L. d'Achery, *Spicilegium*, i. 258–323, 324–336, Paris, 1665.

Consult *Histoire littéraire de la France*, iv. 594–605, v. 20–31; A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters*, ii. 224–230, Leipsic, 1880; Potthast, *Wegweiser*, p. 682.

JONAS, JUSTUS: German Reformer, close friend and associate of Luther; b. at Nordhausen (38 m. w.n.w. of Erfurt), Saxony, June 5, 1493; d. in Eisfeld (40 m. s. of Erfurt), Saxe-Meiningen, Oct. 9, 1555. His real name was Jodocus Koch, but he adopted his father's Christian name as a surname during his university career. In 1506 he matriculated at Erfurt, where he entered into close friendship with Eobanus Hess, whom he emulated in his devotion to humanistic studies and the practise of verse-writing. Having chosen jurisprudence as his special field, he followed the celebrated teacher Henning Göde to Wittenberg in 1511, but returned about three years later to Erfurt, received ordination, and became prebend in the Church of St. Severus and professor in law at the university. A member of the circle of enthusiastic humanists who acknowledged Eobanus as their " king " and worshiped Erasmus as their idol, Jonas took advantage of a pilgrimage made by Eobanus in 1518 to enter into communication with the great scholar. In the following year he made his personal acquaintance, and Erasmus conceived a liking for his young admirer, and subsequently exerted himself to prevent his conversion to the party of Luther. Jonas in return spoke of Erasmus as his " father in Christ," his instructor and guide in the way of right living.

In 1519, while absent in the Netherlands, Jonas was chosen rector of the university, and at the same time comprehensive reforms were enacted whereby the study of Hebrew and Greek together with the " true " philosophy and theology was made a part of the curriculum. On his return Jonas began a series of Bible-readings, in the spirit still of Erasmus and not of Luther. His adhesion to the cause of the great Reformer dates from about the time of the Leipsic Disputation, shortly before which event Luther, through Johann Lang, offered his friendship to Jonas; the latter's first letter bears the date of June, 1520. Upon the death of Henning Göde at Wittenberg in Jan., 1521, Spalatin recommended Jonas as his successor. The elector offered the vacant professorship to Mutianus, who declined, and likewise recommended Jonas. The latter received the appointment at Worms, whither he had accompanied Luther. In June of the same year he removed to Wittenberg, and, embracing with enthusiasm the doctrines of the theologians there, devoted himself to an active championship of the Protestant cause. With some difficulty he succeeded in obtaining his transfer to the theological faculty, in order more freely to devote himself to the religious propaganda.

In the controversies concerning the reform of worship at the court church during Luther's sojourn at the Wartburg, Jonas was one of the most earnest advocates of Protestant innovations. From 1523 to 1533 he was dean of the theological faculty and delivered lectures on the Old and New Testaments, but gradually his professional duties were abandoned for literary labors in the great cause For Luther he carried on a polemic against Johannes Faber over the celibacy of the clergy (1523) and later came into conflict with his fellow student at Erfurt, Georg Witzel. His gifts revealed themselves, especially, however, in his translations from the works of Luther and Melanchthon, from German into Latin and vice versa, gifts of which the two men gladly availed themselves, allowing him full liberty in the handling of their writings; among such translations were the German versions of Luther's *De servo arbitrio* and Melanchthon's *Loci*. At the same time Jonas played an active part in the great events of the Reformation, such as the Marburg Conference and the Diet of Augsburg. In 1532 he became adviser to the three Anhalt principalities and in 1538 drew up a set of church ordinances for the city of Zerbst. Preeminent, however, were his services as visitator during the introduction of the Protestant faith into the duchy of Saxony, and as author of the new church ordinances there enacted. In the establishment of the Reformation in Halle he also played a leading part. In 1541, while passing through that city, he was invited by some of the councilors to remain with them for some time and to instruct them in the Gospel. Jonas began his work under the protection of the elector of Saxony who made use of his long neglected power as burgrave of Halle to further the establishment of the Reformed faith in that town. In 1541–42 the new ritual was introduced into the various churches, and in the summer of the latter year Jonas was made superintendent. In 1543 he drew up the church ordinances for the town. With the aid of the Wittenberg jurist Kilian Goldstein, who had been summoned to Halle as syndic, Jonas carried on the organization of the Protestant Church with a resolute energy that left him little time for literary labors. In 1546 he accompanied Luther on his last journey to Eisleben, stood beside his death-bed, and delivered his funeral oration. Their friendship had never known any interruption and the " Table Talk " and correspondence of the Reformer testify to the intimate relations that prevailed between the two.

Upon the outbreak of the Schmalkald War, Jonas vigorously assailed the emperor and Maurice of Saxony, and on the capture of Halle by the latter in November, 1546, he was compelled to flee. He returned in January, 1547, and made use of the situation to drive the monks and nuns from the city and to wipe out all traces of Roman practise in the church system. But Halle fell a second time into the hands of Maurice, and Jonas was once more a fugitive. His exile seems to have aged him rapidly and to have weakened his powers, but he longed nevertheless for active employment. Through petitions and the intercession of others he sought to appease the anger of Maurice, but it was not until 1548 and after a humiliating submission that he was permitted to return to Halle. There, however, disappointment awaited him; the town council, reluctant to place at the head of affairs a weak old man who numbered among his opponents the powerful elector and the new archbishop of Magdeburg, declined to restore him to his pulpit and restricted him to a lectureship in Latin. In

1550 he became court preacher at Coburg. His friendship with Melanchthon had cooled and on the subject of the Interim Jonas appears as his opponent. Melanchthon, in return, spoke of him as an old man unfit for the performance of active pastoral duties. After a short activity in Regensburg, in 1553 Jonas became superintendent at Eisfeld, where he remained till his death, occupied partially with his old labors as a translator. The picture of a zealous champion of the Reformation, devoting his great gifts and capacity for effort to the cause of the faith, is somewhat tarnished by the unsparing wrath of his polemic and an avarice that was notorious. (G. KAWERAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His letters were published by G. Kawerau, 2 vols., Halle, 1884–85; additions have been made, e.g., by C. A. H. Burkhardt, in *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und Leben*, 1889, pp. 430 sqq. His life has been written by L. Reinhard, Altenburg, 1731; G. C. Knapp, Halle, 1817; H. G. Hasse, Leipsic, 1862; T. Pressel, Elberfeld, 1862; while the *Festschrift* of his four hundredth anniversary was edited by K. Meyer, Nordhausen, 1893. Different phases of his life are treated in: W. Beste, *Kanzelredner der lutherischen Kirche des Reformations-Zeitalters*, i. 149 sqq., Leipsic, 1856; K. Krause, *H. E. Hessus*, vol. i., Gotha, 1879; F. Kropatschek, *J. Dölsch aus Feldkirch*, Greifswald, 1898; G. Bauch, *Die Einführung der melanchthonischen Deklamationen*, Breslau, 1900. Consult also the literature on Luther and on the Reformation.

JONCOURT, jūn″cūr′, **PIERRE DE:** French Protestant; b. at Clermont-en-Beauvoisis (16 m. s.s.e. of Beauvais) c. 1650; d. at The Hague 1715. In 1678 he went from France to Holland and became pastor at Middelburg. In 1686 he was elected secretary of the Walloon Synod of Rotterdam. He was pastor at The Hague from 1699 till his death. His most important work is *Entretiens sur les différentes méthodes d'expliquer l'Écriture* (Amsterdam, 1707), in which he violently attacked the allegorical interpretation, which Cocceius had carried to its extreme limits. In the heat of the ensuing controversy Joncourt said certain things about Cocceius which the Synod of Nimeguen compelled him to retract in 1708.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. Haag, *Hist. des dogmes*, Paris, 1862; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, vii. 427–428.

JONES, JENKINS LLOYD: Independent; b. at Llandyssil (44 m. n.w. of Swansea), Cardiganshire, Wales, Nov. 14, 1843. He emigrated to the United States in childhood and was a farm hand until the age of nineteen. He served in the Union Army for three years, and soon after the close of the Civil War entered Meadville Theological School, from which he was graduated in 1870. He then entered the Unitarian ministry and was pastor of All Souls' Unitarian Church, Jaynesville, Wis., until 1879, being at the same time secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference. He also organized the Western Unitarian Sunday School Society, of which he was secretary for fourteen years. After leaving Jaynesville for Chicago he organized All Souls' Church, of which he has been pastor since 1882. In 1894 this society formally withdrew from all denominational affiliations to emphasize its independency. In 1894 he was one of the founders of the World's Parliament of Religions held in connection with the Chicago Exposition, and was secretary of the meetings of that congress, while as early as 1878 he had been one of the founders of *Unity*, which he has edited since 1879 and which is now the organ of the Congress of Religion movement. He likewise established the Abraham Lincoln Center, of which he is now superintendent, as well as the Chicago Browning Society, and has been first president of the Illinois State Conference of Charities, lecturer in English in the university extension course of the University of Chicago, and president of the Tower Hill Summer School of Literature and Religion. He was one of the organizers of the Municipal Voters' League of Chicago, and takes an active interest in all movements for the advancement of civil service, independency in politics, and similar aims. In theology he was a member of the radical wing of the Unitarians and sympathized and cooperated with the Free Religious Association and kindred organizations. He has now, however, renounced all vestiges of denominationalism. He has written: *The Faith that makes Faithful* (Chicago, 1886; in collaboration with W. C. Gannett); *Practical Piety* (1890); *Word of the Spirit* (1897); *Bits of Wayside Gospel* (2 vols., New York, 1899–1901); and *Nuggets from a Welsh Mine* (Chicago, 1902).

JONES, JEREMIAH: Welsh Biblical critic and Independent minister; b. in Wales 1693; d. there 1724. He was a grandson of Samuel Jones (1628–1697, see JONES, SAMUEL, 1) and was educated by his uncle, Samuel Jones (1680–1719; see JONES, SAMUEL, 2), at Gloucester and Tewkesbury. Among his colleagues in his uncle's academy were Joseph Butler and Thomas Secker, afterward archbishop of Canterbury. After serving Independent congregations at Market Harborough, Leicestershire, and Cold Ashby, Northamptonshire, he became pastor of the Independent church at Nailsworth, in the parish of Avening, Gloucestershire, in 1719, and in the same year took charge of his deceased uncle's pupils. Jones is remembered for his admirable *New and Full Method of Settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament* (3 vols., London, 1726–1727; reprinted, 3 vols., Oxford, 1798, again 1827). He also published *A Vindication of the Former Part of St. Matthew's Gospel from Mr. Whiston's Charge of Dislocations* (London, 1719; reprinted, Salop, 1721, Oxford, 1803).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. J[oulmin], in *Gentleman's Magazine*, June, 1803; *DNB*, xxx. 121–122.

JONES, RUFUS MATTHEW: Friend; b. at South China, Me., Jan. 25, 1863. He was educated at Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. (A.B., 1885), Heidelberg University (1887), and the University of Pennsylvania (1893–95), and was principal of Oak Grove Seminary, Vassalboro, Me., from 1889–1893. Since the latter year he has been professor of philosophy in Haverford College, and has also been editor of *The American Friend* since the same year. He has been a trustee of Bryn Mawr College since 1896 and is a member of the American Philosophical Society. In addition to editing *George Fox: An Autobiography* (Philadelphia, 1903) and *Social Law in the Spiritual World* (1904), he has written *Life of Eli and Sybil Jones* (Philadelphia, 1889); *Practical Christianity* (1899); *A Dynamic Faith*

(London, 1900); and *A Boy's Religion from Memory* (Philadelphia, 1902).

JONES, SAMUEL: 1. One of the founders of Welsh nonconformity; b. near Chirk Castle, Denbighshire, Wales, 1628; d. at Llangynwyd (15 m. w.n.w. of Cardiff), Glamorganshire, Sept. 7, 1697. He studied at Oxford (B.A., 1652; M.A., 1654), first at Merton College, from which he was expelled in 1648 for refusing to submit to the parliamentary board of visitors, and afterward at Jesus College, where he was elected fellow in 1652 and bursar in 1655. In 1657 he was given Presbyterian ordination and inducted to the living of Llangynwyd. On the passing of the Act of Uniformity in 1662 he was ejected from his living and subsequently imprisoned, but in 1672 he was licensed to preach in four private houses besides his own. About this time he established in his farmhouse the first nonconforming theological academy in Wales. In 1689 Jones' school was selected as one of the places for the education of the exhibitioners of the Presbyterian board. To this institution the present Carmarthen Presbyterian College traces its origin. Jones is described by Calamy as " a great philosopher, a considerable master of the Latin and Greek tongues, and a pretty good Orientalist." He was also a poet of some reputation.

Bibliography: Samuel Palmer, *Nonconformists' Memorial*, ii. 624, London, 1778; T. Rees, *Hist. of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales*, pp. 163, 177, 230–242, ib., 1883; *DNB*, xxx. 160–161.

2. Non-conformist tutor in England; b., probably in Pennsylvania, c. 1680; d. in England 1719. He was the son of one Malachi Jones, a Welsh preacher who had emigrated to America. He studied under private tutors in England and in 1706 entered the University of Leyden, where he became the pupil of Herman Witsius and Jacob Perizonius. A few years later he opened an academy at Gloucester, which in 1712 he removed to Tewkesbury. By this time his school had attained considerable repute and numbered among its pupils Joseph Butler, Samuel Chandler, and Thomas Secker. It was from here that Butler carried on his anonymous correspondence with Samuel Clarke (1675–1729). In 1714 the Presbyterian board began to send pupils to Jones. With the exception of two Latin disputations (Leyden, 1708) Jones published nothing. A manuscript copy of his Latin lectures on Jewish antiquities has been preserved. Samuel Clarke gave various transcripts of Jones' lectures to Philip Doddridge, for use in his academy.

Bibliography: Walter Wilson, in *Monthly Repository*, 1809, pp. 651–652; *DNB*, xxx. 161 (where other notices are indicated).

JONES, SAMUEL PORTER: Methodist Episcopal Church, South; b. in Chambers County, Ala., Oct. 16, 1847; d. near Memphis, Tenn., Oct. 15, 1900. He was educated by private tutors and in boarding-schools, and, after serving in the Confederate Army in the Civil War, was admitted to the Georgia bar in 1869. He became addicted to liquor, however, and his career as a lawyer was seriously affected. He was converted in 1872 and was admitted to the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in the same year. He held various pastorates from 1872 to 1880, after which he was agent of the North Georgia Orphanage (1880–92). From that time until his death he was extremely active as a revivalist and advocate of total abstinence, and became one of the best-known Evangelists in the United States, attracting popular attention by his unconventional addresses, which abounded with witty and pregnant sayings. He wrote: *Sermons and Sayings* (Nashville, Tenn., 1883); *Music Hall Series* (Cincinnati, O., 1886); *Quit your Meanness* (1886); *Sam Jones' Own Book* (1887); *St. Louis Series* (1890); and *Thunderbolts* (1895).

JONES, WILLIAM, OF NAYLAND: English theologian; b. at Lowick (19 m. n.e. of Northampton), Northamptonshire, July 30, 1726; d. at Nayland (14 m. s.s.w. of Ipswich), Suffolk, Jan. 6, 1800. He studied at the Charterhouse and at University College, Oxford (B.A., 1749). Here, largely through the influence of his friend, George Horne, he adopted the views of John Hutchinson (q.v.). After his graduation he was curate for a number of years, first at Finedon, afterward at Wadenhoe, Northamptonshire. In 1764 he was presented to the vicarage of Bethersden, and in 1765 to the rectory of Pluckley, both in Kent. On June 22, 1775, he was elected a fellow of the Royal Society. In 1777 he obtained the perpetual curacy of Nayland, Suffolk, and exchanged Pluckley for Paston, Northamptonshire. Thenceforth he resided at Nayland and came to be known as Jones of Nayland. In 1788 he became chaplain to George Horne (bishop of Norwich). He was the originator, though not the editor, of the *British Critic*, a theological quarterly, of which the first number appeared in London in May, 1793. In 1798 he was presented by Archbishop Moore to the sinecure rectory of Hollingbourne, Kent. Jones was a man of vast learning and sound piety, and one of the most prominent churchmen of his time. The school represented by him is regarded as forming a link between the non-jurors and the Oxford school. His works, some forty in number, are written from the Hutchinsonian point of view. The best-known are: *The Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity* (Oxford, 1756; ed. J. L. F. Russell, London, 1866; published by S.P.C.K., 1899); *An Essay on the First Principles of Natural Philosophy* (Oxford, 1762); *Physiological Disquisitions* (London, 1781); *Lectures on the Figurative Language of the Holy Scripture* (1786; new ed., 1863); *An Essay on the Church* (1787; new ed., 1863); and *Memoirs of . . . George Horne* (1795). William Stevens collected and edited his *Works* (12 vols., 1801; reprinted in 6 vols., 1810). Some of his tracts were reprinted under the title, *Tracts on the Church* (Oxford and London, 1850).

Bibliography: W. Stevens, *A Short Account of the Life and Writings of William Jones*, London, 1801; John Hunt, *Hist. of Religious Thought in England*, iii. 306–319, ib. 1873; L. Stephen, *Hist. of English Thought in the 18th Century*, viii. 18–20, xii. 89, 2 vols., New York, 1881; J. H. Overton, *The Church in England*, ii. 258, 290–291, London, 1897; J. H. Overton and F. Relton, *The English Church (1714–1800)*, pp. 206–207 et passim, ib. 1906; *DNB*, xxx. 177–178.

JONES, WILLIAM BASIL: Bishop of St. Davids; b. at Cheltenham Jan. 2, 1822; d. at Abergwili (2 m. n.e. of Carmarthen), Wales, Jan. 14, 1897. From the Shrewsbury School, where he spent seven years, he passed to the University of Oxford (B.A., 1844; M.A., 1847). He was a scholar of Trinity College, 1840–45, fellow of Queen's College, 1848–51, fellow of University College 1851–57, tutor 1854–58, lecturer on modern history 1858–65, and select preacher 1860–62, 1866–67, 1876–78, as also select preacher at Cambridge in 1881. He took a prominent part in the formation of the Cambrian Archeological Association in 1846–47, was one of its general secretaries, 1848–51, and joint editor for the association in 1851. At Oxford he formed an intimate friendship with William Thompson, afterward archbishop of York, through whom he received many preferments. He was examining chaplain to Thompson 1861–74, prebendary of York Minster 1863–74, perpetual curate of Haxby 1863–65, vicar of Bishopthorpe 1865–74, archdeacon of York 1867–74, rural dean of Bishopthorpe 1869–74, chancellor of York 1871–74 and canon residentiary of York 1873–74. He was elevated to the see of St. David's in 1874. He was remarkably successful in advancing the work of education and missions in his diocese.

His more important works are: *Vestiges of the Gael in Gwynedd* (London, 1851); *The History and Antiquities of St. David's* (4 parts, 1852–57), in collaboration with E. A. Freeman; *The New Testament Illustrated with a Plain Explanatory Commentary for Private Reading* (2 vols., 1865), in collaboration with Archdeacon Churton; *The Peace of God: Sermons on the Reconciliation of God and Man* (1869); and *Ordination Addresses* (Oxford, 1900), with a preface by Gregory Smith.

Bibliography: I. G. Smith, *Holy Days*, p. 67, London, 1900; *DNB*, supplement, iii. 47–49, where reference to scattered notices is given.

JORAM (JEHORAM; the two forms are used interchangeably in the sources):

1. Fifth king of Judah, son and successor of Jehoshaphat. His dates according to the old chronology are 892–885 B.C.; according to Kamphausen, 851–844 B.C.; according to Duncker, 848–844 B.C.; according to Curtis (*DB*, i. 401), 851–843 B.C. The Chronicler (II Chron. xxi. 2–4) reports that on Joram's accession he put his brothers to death. No notice of this occurs in Kings, but the fact is not improbable since he had married Athaliah, daughter of Ahab and Jezebel of Israel, where assassination was not uncommon. Moreover, Athaliah's usurpation of the kingdom through assassination (see Joash), together with her known influence over her husband, increases the probability. The notable event of Joram's reign was the revolt of Edom and his narrow escape from capture when he was trying to reduce the Edomites to subjection. The revolt of Edom is but the reflex of the prior revolt of the Moabites from the northern kingdom (see 2, below). The indications of a general revolt are increased by the Chronicler's narrative concerning a body of Arabs and Philistines who sacked Joram's palace and carried off all his sons but one. The Chronicler attributes his death to a loathsome disease (probably the same as that described in Acts xii. 23), and asserts that his burial was dishonorable (but cf. II Kings viii. 24).

2. Ninth king of Israel, second son of Ahab and successor to his brother Ahaziah. His dates, according to the old chronology are 896–884 B.C.; according to Kamphausen, 854–843 B.C.; according to Duncker, 851–843 B.C.; according to Curtis, 852–842 B.C. One of the events of his reign was an unsuccessful attempt, in company with Jehoshaphat of Judah, to reduce to subjection the Moabites who, according to the Moabite stone (q.v.), had revolted from his brother. The army arrived before the fortress of Kir-hareseth and besieged it; and in the straits of the siege the "king of Moab" sacrificed his son on the wall in sight of the besiegers. This act dismayed the allies and they withdrew. It is not impossible that the "great wrath" of II Kings iii. 24 (R. V., margin) indicates a pestilence which attacked Israel and was attributed to the offended deity. A second event was the attempt to recover Ramoth-gilead from the Arameans, in which Joram was assisted by Ahaziah of Judah. He was wounded and obliged to retire to Jezreel, near which he fell at the hands of Jehu. It is an open question whether the events of II Kings iv.–viii. 15 belong to Joram's reign, as the king of Israel of that narrative is not named. It is clear from II Kings ix. 22 and x. 18–27 that the Baal cult had flourished in Joram's reign, while II Kings iii. 13–14 is emphatic as to the continuing influence of Jezebel.

Bibliography: The sources for 1 are: I Kings xxii. 50; II Kings viii. 16–24, 29; II Chron. xxi.; and for 2 are: II Kings i. 17, iii., viii. 28–ix. 26. The literature is given under Ahab. Consult also: C. F. Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of . . . Kings*, Oxford, 1903; *DB*, ii. 559–560; *EB*, ii. 2350–2352.

JORDAN. See Palestine.

JORDAN, HERMANN SIEGFRIED ARNOLD: German Lutheran; b. at Sandau-an-der-Elbe (35 m. n.w. of Brandenburg) July 30, 1878. He was educated at the universities of Erlangen (1896–97) and Greifswald (1897–99; lic. theol., 1902), and after being a private tutor in Deyelsdorf, Pomerania, from 1899 to 1903, was connected with the cathedral-chapter of Berlin in 1903–04. Since the latter year he has been privat-docent for New-Testament exegesis and church history in the University of Greifswald. He has written: *Die Theologie der neuentdeckten Predigten Novatians* (Leipsic, 1902); *Rhythmische Prosa in der altchristlichen lateinischen Literatur* (1905); and *Rhythmische Prosatexte aus der ältesten Christenheit* (1905).

JORDANIS (originally perhaps **Jornandes**): The first and only Gothic historian whose works are extant; d. c. 560. He descended from a noble family related to the royal family of the Amali. His grandfather had been notary of the Alanic King Candac in Moesia. Jordanis was also notary until his conversion, which probably implies that he assumed an ecclesiastical position. He was probably bishop of Croton, in any case not an Arian, but a Catholic. Vigilius, to whom he dedicated one of his works, seems to have been the pope of that name (538–555), and they were both in Constantinople about 551. Jordanis left two works, a history of the Goths or rather of Moesia, which seems to have had the title *De origine et actibusque Get-*

arum, and a compendium of universal history, often called *De regnorum ac temporum successione*, also *De breviatione chronicorum*, by Mommsen *De summa temporum vel origine actibusque gentis Romanorum.* The former he dedicated to his otherwise unknown friend Castalius or Castulus, the latter to Vigilius. The history of the Goths, which extends to 551, was written probably in that year in Constantinople or in Chalcedon. The chronicle of the world had been begun between Apr., 550, and Apr., 551, before the other work, but is continued until 552. The history of the Goths shows little originality as it follows closely the lost work of Cassiodorus which seems to have had the same title. Toward the end Jordanis used also the annals of Marcellinus Comes. The style is obscure, artificial, and sententious, but this is undoubtedly due to the source used by Jordanis. The fundamental view of the identity of the Getae and Goths is probably also borrowed from Cassiodorus. The universal history is practically a history of Rome; for the rest Jordanis furnishes merely genealogies and names of kings. The work contains nothing but extracts from other historians.

(WILHELM ALTMANN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His History of the Goths has been printed often, best ed., by A. Holder, Freiburg, 1882. Both his works are edited by T. Mommsen in *MGH*, *Auct. Ant.*, v. 1 (1882), 1–138, with prefatorial notes, pp. v.–lxxiv. A very useful list of editions and literature is given by Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 682–684. A useful article on his life and works is in *DCB*, iii. 431–438. Consult: L. von Ranke, *Weltgeschichte*, iv. 2, pp. 313–327, Leipsic, 1884; A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters*, i. 556–562, Leipsic, 1889; W. S. Teuffel, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, pp. 1256–1259, 1283, ib. 1890.

JORIS (or **JORISZOON,** " the son of George "), **JAN DAVID:** Dutch Anabaptist; b., probably at Ghent or Bruges, 1501 or 1502; d. at Basel Aug. 25, 1556. He was originally a glass-painter, but was of an adventurous disposition, and after long wanderings abroad settled in Delft and married. An ultra-enthusiast, he eagerly embraced the Reformation, circulated hymns and tracts, and violently assailed the priesthood and the mass. In 1528 he publicly insulted a religious procession, for which he was imprisoned, pilloried, flogged, and had his tongue burned through, in addition to being banished for three years. He then joined the Anabaptists, among whom he speedily became prominent, although he disapproved the Anabaptist insurrection at Münster (q.v.) and openly opposed Battenburg, the leader of the extreme radicals. After the fall of Münster, Joris sought to reunite the Anabaptist factions, but his success was only temporary, and he was attacked by sectaries of all shades. On the other hand, enthusiasts called him " the hallowed of the Lord," and proclaimed him a prophet and bringer of judgment, so that in 1536 he himself became convinced of his divine mission. At the same time he began to have visions, and gradually gathered about him a circle of followers (the " Davidists ") who trusted him implicitly, even forming a distinct Anabaptist sect with a chiliastic basis. The chief centers of its activity were Oldenburg, eastern Friesland, and the Netherlands, but after 1538 the authorities sharply opposed it, and many of its adherents were executed. Joris himself, however, repeatedly escaped in such remarkable ways as to give rise to the belief that he could make himself invisible. Meanwhile he was untiring in his activity. He had already had much success among the followers of Battenburg, and for a time among the Anabaptists of Münster, but the adherents of Melchior Hoffmann in Strasburg, like Johannes a Lasco and Menno Simons, rejected his overtures. The Landgrave Philip of Hesse, on the other hand, granted him protection on condition of his accepting the Augsburg Confession. His unceasing personal propaganda was aided by his numerous writings, of which the most important was his *t'Wonderboeck, waerin dat van der wereldt aan versloten gheopenbaert is* (Deventer [?], 1542), a jumbled mass of fantasy, mystery, and allegory.

With the amassing of wealth from his adherents and the despair of gaining a great following, a new period began in the career of Joris. In Aug., 1544, he appeared at Basel under the name of John of Bruges, a rich and distinguished fugitive from Holland for the sake of the Gospel. He was accepted as a citizen, led an irreproachable religious life, was conspicuous for his charities, and acquired considerable property, including a small castle at Binningen. His propaganda was now restricted to writing mystic treatises and epistles to his followers, whom he urged to conform externally to the existing Church. On the other hand, he was in touch with opponents of the dominant Church, pleading for Servetus in an anonymous petition of 1553, writing to Schwenckfeld (though he opposed his deification of the humanity of Christ), and being acquainted with Castellio. The identity of " John of Bruges " with the Dutch Anabaptist Jan David Joris was not discovered until three years after his death and burial. In Apr., 1559, the University of Basel condemned Joris as a heretic and on May 13 his body was exhumed and burned, together with his books and portrait. His Basel adherents were obliged to do penance in the cathedral on June 6, but in Holstein and Holland the sect lingered, heresy-trials of the Davidists occurring as late as the end of the sixteenth century.

(A. HEGLER†.) K. HOLL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A favorably partizan account is given by G. Arnold, *Kirchen- und Ketzer-Historie*, 4 vols., Frankfort, 1700–15, corrected by the critical discussion of Nippold, in *ZHT*, 1863, 1864, 1868. Joris' biography was written by A. van der Linde, The Hague, 1867, cf. *Bibliophile Belge*, 1865, pp. 137, 158, 1866, pp. 129 sqq. On his teaching consult A. Jundt, *Histoire du panthéisme*, pp. 164 sqq., Strasburg, 1875.

JORTIN, JOHN: Archdeacon of London; b. in London Oct. 23, 1698; d. there Sept. 5, 1770. He was the son of a Huguenot exile from Brittany, who in 1691 became a gentleman of the privy chamber. He received his education at the Charterhouse School, and at Jesus College, Cambridge (B.A., 1719; M.A., 1721), where he held a fellowship 1721–28. He was ordained in 1724, and presented to the college living of Swavesey, Cambridgeshire, in Jan., 1727, which he resigned in Feb., 1731, to become preacher at a chapel in New Street, London. In 1731 he started a magazine entitled, *Miscellaneous Observations upon Authors,* *Ancient and Modern*, which continued for two years. In 1737 he was presented to the vicarage of Eastwell, Kent, which he soon resigned. In 1747 he resigned his position in New Street to accept an appointment to a chapel in Oxenden Street, where he preached till 1760. He was assistant to Warburton at Lincoln's Inn, 1747–50, and Boyle lecturer in 1749. In 1751 he was presented to the rectory of St. Dunstan's-in-the-East by Thomas Herring, archbishop of Canterbury, who gave him the Lambeth degree of D.D. in 1755. In 1762 he became chaplain to Thomas Osbaldeston, bishop of London, who gave him a prebend in St. Paul's and presented him to the vicarage of Kensington, which he held with St. Dunstan's. He was made archdeacon of London in 1764. Jortin was a scholar of liberal views, and wrote with an engaging lightness of style. His more important works are: *Discourses on the Truth of the Christian Religion* (London, 1746); *Remarks upon Ecclesiastical History* (5 vols., 1751–73); *Six Dissertations* (1755); *The Life of Erasmus* (2 vols., 1758–60); *Sermons* (7 vols., 1771–72); and *Tracts, Philological, Critical, and Miscellaneous* (2 vols., 1790).

Bibliography: J. Disney, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of John Jortin*, London, 1792; A *Memoir* by R. Heathcote to the 3d ed. of Jortin's *Sermons*, ed. R. Jortin, ib. 1787; another to the edition of the *Tracts*, ut sup.; while a *Life* is prefixed by W. Trollope to an edition of the *Remarks*, 2 vols., ib. 1846. Consult *DNB*, xxx. 201–203.

JOSEPH OF ARIMATHEA: A wealthy and pious member of the Sanhedrin who begged the body of Jesus and laid it in his own tomb, which had not hitherto been used—a fact in which the Evangelists evidently see symbolic significance. The story is told in all four Gospels (Matt. xxvii. 57–60; Mark xv. 42–46; Luke xxiii. 50–54; John xix. 38–42), and the manner of telling betrays a warm interest in Joseph's personality, his courage, and his piety. Arimathea is probably to be identified with Ramah or Ramathaim (Josh. xviii. 25; I Sam. i. 1; I Macc. xi. 34), five miles north of Jerusalem. Won by the preaching of Jesus concerning the kingdom of God, Joseph openly joined himself to the disciples of Jesus, and he did not consent to the judgment of the Sanhedrin. The differences of the reports in the Gospels are probably to be solved as follows; Mark and Luke have in mind simply the fact that Joseph had prepared a worthy grave; how he had come to do it was not a question with which they concerned themselves. Matthew took this into account and explained that it had been prepared for Joseph himself. John, who appears to have had the other accounts before him, seems to have raised the question why Jesus was not laid in a grave of his own instead of in a stranger's, and answers it by reference to the nearness of the Sabbath, the consequent lack of time for preparations, and the handiness of the grave already prepared.

(K. Schmidt.)

Bibliography: The subject is discussed in the sections devoted to the burial of Jesus in the principal lives cited under Jesus Christ, and in the Bible Dictionaries. Pertinent matter will be found in the discussions of the Gospel of Peter and the Acts of Pilate mentioned under Apocrypha, B, 7.

JOSEPH AND ASENATH, STORY OF. See Pseudepigrapha, Old Testament, II., 36.

JOSEPH BRYENNIOS: Byzantine theologian of the fifteenth century; b., probably in Lacedaemon, about 1350; d. apparently in Crete about 1436. Bryennios, whose original name was Bladynteros, entered a Cretan monastery about 1375, but some twenty years later was obliged to leave the island on account of a conflict with the clergy. He then went to Constantinople, joined the Studites, and soon became the court chaplain of the Emperor Manuel Palæologus, thus gaining an important influence in ecclesiastical polity. In 1416 and 1418 he was imperial ambassador to the West, and at first enjoyed the favor of John Palæologus, but when the emperor, for reasons of state, favored union with the Latin Church, Joseph, a rigid antagonist of this measure, retired from public life, and apparently spent the last years of his life in Crete. He was primarily a theologian, although his writings (first edited by Eugenius Bulgaris, 3 vols., Leipsic, 1768–84) contain a mass of material on all branches of Byzantine learning, especially rhetoric, dialectics, geometry, astronomy, physics, and philosophy. He was the author of twenty-one addresses and three dialogues on the Trinity, while other sermons are devoted to the Virgin, redemption, eschatology, faith, the plan of salvation, Easter, the Transfiguration, and the Tabor-light. His attitude toward union is given in his "Speech of Counsel" and "On the Union of the Cretans," while his twenty-six letters contain many theological allusions. Bryennios was rigidly orthodox and had no sympathy with humanism or with western thought. The prime source of authority, in his opinion, was the Bible, which was supplemented by the Church Fathers, who had established the truth of the dogmas contained in the Scriptures, so that these principles required no further proof and were superior to human reason. God can be defined only negatively, and man was created as the end of creation. Seeking to gain his apotheosis by his own powers, however, he lost the fellowship of God, though he retained the freedom of the will. The mission of Christ was to enable man to attain the end for which he was created, the special agency being the manifestation of the person of the Lord.

(Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, xi. 659–660, Hamburg, 1808; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, p. 114; P. Meyer, in *TSK*, lxix (1896), 282–319; idem, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 1896, pp. 74–111; J. Dräsecke, in *NKZ*, 1896, pp. 208–228.

JOSEPH THE CARPENTER, HISTORY OF. See Apocrypha, B, I., 4.

JOSEPH, THE HUSBAND OF MARY: In the primitive Church there are no historic records of a special cult in honor of Joseph, and the earliest monuments of Christian art represent him only in groups with Mary and the Christ-child. In this period he appears as a young man, and it is not until the fifth or sixth century that he is represented as aged, a concept borrowed from the apocryphal Gospels of the Infancy. According to the legend incorporated in these documents, Joseph, when he married Mary, was an aged widower, having as sons by his first marriage James, Joses, Judas, and Simon (cf. Matt. xiii. 55; Mark

The Veneration of Joseph.

vi. 1 sqq.). This tradition persisted throughout the Middle Ages, but is now disregarded by occidental Roman Catholicism, which regards Joseph, if not as a young man, at least in the prime of manhood. It is very possible that he died early, as mention of him disappears from the Gospels; and since the days of Ambrose and Jerome it has been a Roman dogma that his marriage with Mary was merely nominal, although this view receives no certain confirmation from the New Testament. Legend, followed by later medieval art, holds that Joseph died in 18 or 27 A.D., with Mary and Jesus by his side, and, according to some accounts, John the Evangelist. This tradition, combined with the fact that older legends occasionally speak of his grave, but never mention his remains, forms the kernel of the medieval legends and regulations for the Joseph cult. Jean Gerson, Bernardino of Siena, and Francis of Sales declared that he had been translated bodily to heaven. The cult of Joseph flourished in the West after the seventeenth century, and relics began to appear, although these were never corporal, but such objects as his ring of betrothal, or pieces of his garments.

In the early Church Joseph possessed no special day, and until the medieval period the traditions on this subject were divergent. The Copts celebrated July 20, while among the Greeks his day was the Fourth Sunday in Advent, which was also dedicated to Mary, David, and James the Just. Another day, however, Mar. 19, said to have been brought to the West by a Syrian Carmelite of the fourteenth century, gradually found acceptation, and was finally confirmed by Gregory XV. in 1621. Pius IX., in 1870, made this feast one of the first class, and declared St. Joseph the patron saint of the entire Roman Catholic Church, and Leo XIII., in 1889, ordered a series of rosary prayers to St. Joseph for the whole of October.

Joseph Orders.

All orders founded in honor of St. Joseph and called by his name are modern in origin. The following orders of men, established under his protection as the Biblical ideal of obedience, may be mentioned: (1) The Secular Priests of St. Joseph were founded at Rome in 1620 by Paolo Motta, and their rule, partly based on that of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri, was confirmed by Innocent XI. in 1684. (2) The Crétenists, or Missionaries of St. Joseph (Josephites), were established about the middle of the seventeenth century by Jacques Crétenet, a surgeon of Lyons. They were chiefly mission-preachers and spread through many dioceses of France, but were overwhelmed by the Revolution, although they were later revived as heads of educational institutes in various places. (3) The Brethren of St. Joseph were founded at St. Suscien, near Amiens, by Bishop J. P. de Chabons in 1823, imitating an elder body of the eighteenth century, to conduct primary schools, assist the clergy in catechizing, promote singing, and similar purposes. (4) The Josephites, or Sons of St. Joseph, were established at Grammont, Belgium, by Canon Van Combrugghe in 1817 for the education of young men of the better classes. Besides the mother house at Grammont, they have daughter houses at Melle, Jouvain, Tillemont, and Brunelle, in Belgium, and St. George's College, at Weybridge, England; they are assisted by the Josephite nuns of Bruges. (5) The Josephite Brothers of the Holy Cross were founded in 1821 in the diocese of Le Mans by the priest Dujarrie. Until recently they possessed some forty houses in France, the French colonies, and North America, and devote themselves primarily to the training of artisans, although some conduct secondary schools. (6) The Brothers of St. Joseph, founded at Quillins (department of Rhône) by Abbé Rey in 1835 for the education of destitute children, had their chief center at Citeaux from 1848 to 1888, but are now suppressed.

The majority of female orders of St. Joseph are French. The oldest and most widely extended is (1) the Congregation of St. Joseph at Bordeaux, founded in 1638 by Marie Delpech de l'Estang; it extended rapidly to other cities of northern and western France, forming at La Rochelle in 1672 a new branch called Religieuses de la Congrégation de Saint Joseph, dite de la Trinité (or, de Jesus, Marie, et Joseph). (2) The Hospital Sisters of St. Joseph of La Flèche (in Anjou) were established in 1642, while about 1650 the Jesuit Medaille founded (3) the Daughters of St. Joseph at Le Puy. These three orders in twenty years had over 9,000 members and 1,200 houses throughout all France. The order last named established at Clermont in 1666, through the advice of Canon Laborieux, (4) the Nuns of St. Joseph of the Good Shepherd to conduct refuges for fallen women. It survived the Revolution and still has its mother house at Clermont, with some sixty daughter houses. About 1800 Mother Javouhey founded (5) the Sisters of St. Joseph at Cluny, whence they spread to Senegambia, French Guiana, and other colonies of France, excepting Algiers and Cochin-China. (6) The Sisters of St. Joseph of the Visitation were founded at Marseilles about 1840 by Emilie Vialard, who, in 1834, had established a similar sisterhood at Alby for the instruction of the young and the care of the sick. Daughter houses of these two sisterhoods have spread to Algiers and Tunis (from Alby), as well as to Jerusalem (from Marseilles). (7) A North American order of Sisters of St. Joseph was founded at Emmitsburg, Md., in 1809 by Eliza Ann Seton, which in 1850 was united with the American Sisters of Mercy and as early as 1868 had ninety-one houses with some 1,100 sisters.

(O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the cult: *ASB*, 19 Mar., vol. iii.; Benedict XIV., *De servorum Dei beatificatione*, iv. 2, chap. 20, 7–58, Bonona, 1738; *Primauté de S. Joseph d'après l'épiscopal catholique et la théologie*, Paris, 1897; J. Seitz, *Die Verehrung des heiligen Joseph in ihren geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Freiburg, 1908; *KL*, vi. 1878–1879. On the orders: Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, iv. 405, 411 sqq., viii. 25 sqq., 186 sqq.; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, vol. iii. passim; *KL*, vi. 1874–1878.

JOSEPH OF METHONE: Greek theologian of the fifteenth century. Of his life little is known, except that he lived in Crete and was a zealous advocate of the union between the Greek and Latin Churches, the majority of his writings, which are collected in *MPG*, clix., being devoted to this object. His most noteworthy work was his defense of the five chief theses of the Council of Florence, discussing at length the procession of the Holy Ghost, unleavened bread, purgatory, eternal life, and the supremacy of the pope. This treatise was at first erroneously ascribed to Gennadius Scholarius. Joseph also discussed the same council in the long dialogue first edited by Leo Allatius in his *Graecia orthodoxa*, i. 583–654 (Rome, 1652).

(Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, xi. 458, Hamburg, 1808; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 118–119.

JOSEPH THE PATRIARCH: Oldest son of Jacob and Rachel. The name "Joseph" (Hebr. *Yoseph*) was probably originally Joseph-el, "may God add" (Gen. xxx. 24; see Jacob). The relation of the sources of the story of the patriarch as given in the Book of Genesis (xxx. 22–24, xxxvii., xxxix. 1) is similar to that in the history of Jacob (q.v.). E and J predominate, P being used more extensively only toward the end (Gen. xlvi. 1). The attempt to distinguish between E and J is without convincing success. It is asserted that J calls the traveling Arabian merchants Ishmaelites, while E calls them Midianites; that E (Gen. xxxvii. 28) makes them take Joseph out of the pit without the complicity of his brothers and so "steal" him (Gen. xl. 15) while, according to J, he was sold by his brothers (also according to Gen. xlv. 4); that for J Joseph's Egyptian master was a wealthy private citizen, for E, the captain of the guard and keeper of the prison. In all essential points, however, the story must have been told in the same way by both E and J. Joseph's character justifies Jacob's especial love. Its fundamental quality was his earnest fear of God (Gen. xxxvii. 2, xxxix. 9, xli. 16, xlii. 18, xlv. 8, l. 19–20), who showed him grace both in his own sight and before men, making him appear the purest and the noblest of the sons of Jacob.

The Sources.

Historicity of the Narrative.

In considering the historical value of the tradition of Joseph, the references to Egypt, its customs, manners, etc., are of especial importance. Modern investigation of the monuments has explained and justified the recital. While formerly many scholars thought to find in Joseph's story erroneous statements of Egyptian conditions, Hengstenberg and the Egyptologists Ebers and Brugsch have shown that the story is almost entirely concordant with the monuments of Egypt. Caravan trade was carried on by the Arabs from the most remote times between Syria, Palestine, and the country of the Nile; precisely the three spices mentioned in Gen. xxxvii. 25 (cf. xliii. 11) were always staple articles of commerce between Gilead and Egypt; the caravan route, after crossing the Jordan at Beth-shan, passed by Dothan; there was a good market for young slaves in Egypt; Potiphar bears a genuine Egyptian name ("devoted to Ra"); such stewardships as that with which Joseph was entrusted by Potiphar appear frequently in the Egyptian inscriptions and on the monuments; the scene between Joseph and Potiphar's wife is practically duplicated in a story preserved in the D'Orbiney Papyrus ("The Tale of Two Brothers"), written down for Seti II. when he was crown prince (cf. H. Brugsch, *Aus dem Orient*, Berlin, 1864, pp. 7 sqq.; Eng. transl. in W. M. F. Petrie, *Egyptian Tales*, London, 1894–95; cf. A. H. Sayce, *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, London, 1894); dreams were matters of intense interest in Egypt; the two court officials of Gen. xl. 1 appear as representatives of the court butlers and the court bakers, even the title "chief of the bakers" has been found; an illustration of the dream of the court baker is given in a representation of the court bakery of Rameses III. (J. G. Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, ii. 385, London, 1837), wherein a load of freshly baked bread on a board or mat (elsewhere a basket, Wilkinson, ii. 393) is borne away on the head; according to the Rosetta stone and the Decree of Canopus, Egyptian kings on their birthdays were accustomed to issue amnesties; the double dream of the Pharaoh (Gen. xli.) is thoroughly Egyptian; the very words *ye'or*, "stream" (=Nile) and *aḥu*, "reed-grass," are Egyptian; the number seven was significant in the land; the kine, that is, the good and the lean years, quite properly come up out of the stream which was the object of divine honors as the fructifier of the entire country; the cow is symbolical of Isis-Hathor, the female principle of fertility, and therefore especially appropriate for the representation of the productivity of the land; the "magicians" of chap. xli. 8 correspond to the sacred scribes who, besides devoting themselves to the arts of writing, mensuration, and astronomy, were also entrusted with the task of explaining portents; the shaving of the hair and the changing of clothing on the occasion of an appearance before the Pharaoh (Gen. xli. 14) was required by ancient Egyptian custom, while among the Israelites baldness was regarded as an infirmity; the ceremonies accompanying the conferral of his new dignities upon Joseph (Gen. xli. 42) are all faithfully represented on the monuments; the cry *abrech* (Gen. xli. 43, E. V. margin) which was shouted by a runner appears, indeed, to have been an Assyrio-Babylonian title, but the names given in xli. 45 are clearly Egyptian. As master of the granaries, Joseph really held the place in the kingdom next after that of the Pharaoh; hence he properly calls himself (xlv. 8) Pharaoh's father, lord over his whole house, ruler of all the land of Egypt; in chap. xlii. 6 he is called "governor" over the land; the designation *adhon*, "lord," has even found its way into Egyptian and the title *ab-en-pira'o* in the sense of "counselor of the Pharaoh" occurs often in the papyri. The economic regulations promulgated by Joseph must be judged according to the standard of Egyptian conditions. The tax imposed (xli. 34) was, in the rich land of Egypt, neither hard to bear nor unusual, and the fact that the State assumed possession of all landed property, with the exception of that belonging to the priests, was a result of the centralizing tendency, more necessary and therefore more justifiable in that land than elsewhere. Two cases of this kind are given in H. Brugsch, *Geschichte Aegyptens*, Leipsic, 1877, pp. 130, 244 sqq., Eng. transl., London, 1879. The fact that Canaan suffered from a drought at the same time is also in accord with natural conditions, and the Amarna Tablets record that Canaan imported corn from Egypt (cf. H. Brugsch, *Die biblischen sieben Jahre der Hungersnot,* Leipsic, 1891; Sayce, ut sup., pp. 217–218). Since Egypt was the great producer of wheat, the Semitic tribes in times of scarcity naturally migrated thither, where they were not seldom received with justifiable suspicion (xlii. 9). The settlement of the Hebrews in the land of Goshen (q.v.) is in accord with the conditions, since this territory had for a long time been the resort of invading Semites and was adapted to the nomadic manner of life. Finally, the embalming of Joseph and the seventy days mourning for him (l. 1 sqq.) are thoroughly Egyptian. Taking all these facts together, it is impossible to escape the conviction which Ebers expresses: "The whole of Joseph's history, even in its smallest details, must be regarded as in accord with the actual conditions in Egypt." To be sure, this general agreement with Egyptian conditions and manners does not of itself positively establish the historic character of the recital; but the assertion that the author or compiler was not familiar with Egyptian conditions is equally pure assumption. It is true that several things, especially the mention of the "Land of Rameses" (Gen. xlvii. 11), a name which could scarcely have been used before the nineteenth dynasty, make it unlikely that Joseph's story is from a nearly contemporaneous source. It seems probable that the account was written about the time of the Exodus (A. H. Sayce, ut sup., pp. 212–213).

The Date of Joseph.

The determination of the period of Egyptian history to which the Hebrew immigration belongs depends upon the relations of the Hebrews with the Hyksos. Josephus' supposition (*Apion,* i. 14) that this nomadic people of Semitic race was identical with the Hebrews does not agree with the modest position the Hebrews occupied in the land according to the Biblical narrative. But Joseph's activity must have fallen in the Hyksos period. The 430 (or 400) years of the Egyptian bondage (Ex. xii. 40; Gen. xv. 13), even if the Exodus took place under Merneptah and certainly if it took place earlier, point to that period. Georgius Syncellus gives Aphophis as the name of the Pharaoh of the Exodus, that is, the Apepi of the monuments, who, according to Brugsch, reigned shortly before the beginning of the eighteenth dynasty. To this time belongs also, in the opinion of Brugsch, the famine of many years mentioned in his *Geschichte Aegyptens,* pp. 243 sqq. The Hyksos kings may have been as anxious to attract Semitic settlers as the first rulers of the New Empire (eighteenth dynasty) were to hold them aloof or to oppress them. The darkness, however, which enshrouds the period of the Hyksos, especially the ruthless destruction of their monuments by a later dynasty, may have obliterated all definite information of Joseph and his family. In general, in the memory of the Egyptians, this tribe was confused with the other Semitic inhabitants of the Delta, and consequently separate features of the history of Joseph and Moses appear confusedly interwoven with other events in Egyptian tradition. Among Jews and Mohammedans the tale of Joseph's fate was especially fancied, and it has been embellished with much legendary matter, especially by the Mohammedans (cf. *Koran,* surah xii.).

C. von Orelli.

Bibliography: The sources are: Gen. xxx. 22–24, xxxvii., xxxix. 1. The best condensed treatment of the subject is either the article by Driver in *DB,* ii. 767–775, or the article in *EB,* ii. 2583–2594. There is a monograph by H. G. Tomkins, *Life and Times of Joseph in the Light of Egyptian Lore,* London, 1891. Consult further, besides the literature mentioned in the text: E. W. Hengstenberg, *Die Bücher Moses und die Aegypter,* Berlin, 1841; C. von Lengerke, *Kanaan,* pp. 331 sqq., Königsberg, 1844; G. Ebers, *Die Aegypter und die Bücher Moses,* vol. i., Leipsic, 1868; A. H. Sayce, *Patriarchal Palestine,* pp. 200 sqq., London, 1895; W. Staerk, *Studien zur Religions- und Sprachgeschichte,* ii. 21 sqq., Berlin, 1899. For the bearing of research in Egypt on the Joseph story see the literature cited under Egypt. Some parallels to the story and to that of the "Two Brothers" are given in A. Lang, *Myth, Ritual and Religion,* ii. 303–308, London, 1887. On the general relations of archeology cf. the article by Driver in D. G. Hogarth, *Authority and Archaeology,* London, 1899.

JOSEPH II.

The Enlightenment. Political Reforms (§ 1).
Governmental Control of the Church (§ 2).
Position of the Clergy in the State (§ 3).
Reforms Affecting the Cure of Souls (§ 4).
Religious Toleration Established (§ 5).
Successes and Failures of the Reforms (§ 6).

1. The Enlightenment. Political Reforms.

Joseph II., Holy Roman Emperor 1765–90, son of Francis I. (grand duke of Tuscany, emperor, 1745–65) and Maria Theresa (queen of Bohemia and Hungary, archduchess of Austria, 1740–48), was born at Vienna Mar. 13, 1741, and died there Feb. 20, 1790. Austria stands in the front rank of strictly Roman Catholic countries which in the second half of the eighteenth century found themselves compelled to break with their antiquated system to find the way for a new existence. The defeats of Austria, especially in the Seven Years' War (1756–1763), had shown Maria Theresa the lack of centralization, of financial, intellectual, and moral power in her country and the necessity of reforms. Although a good Catholic and personally antagonistic to the Enlightenment, she permitted the leaders of this intellectual movement to expand the new views of Territorialism (q.v.) and Febronianism (see Hontheim, Johann Nikolaus von). Archduke Joseph became one of the most prominent and fervent advocates of the new ideas, and when he became coregent after the death of Emperor Francis (Aug. 18, 1765), ecclesiastical reforms were carried out in a more thorough and independent manner, especially as popes like Clement XIV. (1769–74) and Pius VI. (1775–1799) tried to save the hierarchy by the most far-reaching concessions. On the death of the empress in 1780 Joseph became sole ruler, and now began an entirely new system, which was carried out within a few years. The old feudal order was to make room for the monarchical state of the Enlightenment, in which no privileged classes and estates existed. In the political sphere Joseph continued the centralization of the old Hapsburg countries; in the social sphere he attempted to raise the state of the peasants and of industry. Serfdom was abolished, taxes on landed property were equalized, and the industrial life was freed from its paralyzing fetters.

2. Governmental Control of the Church.

Joseph was a pronounced territorialist. All external relations of the Church (i.e., everything outside of the dogmas in the proper sense), the administration of the sacraments, and inner discipline over the clergy, were to be placed under the regulating and supervising power of the State. He thought of the relation of the churches of his countries to Rome entirely in the Febronian sense. The peculiarity of his system of church polity has been styled Josephinism, a term which implies the union of Febronianism, Episcopalianism, and territorialism, with the political viewpoint dominating. He was in no way hostile to the Church; Roman Catholicism appeared to him the historically developed and therefore the natural form of churchdom in his countries; but he did not subject his government to merely ecclesiastical points of view. The Church appeared to him only as the organization of one of the spheres in which the life of the people develops, and which is therefore subordinated to the whole, the State. The ultimate aim of all his reforms was the supremacy of the State. The means was the introduction of the enlightenment to raise up new ethical and intellectual power. Accordingly, the churches of the Hapsburg countries were to be detached, as far as possible, from their legal connection with the papacy and consolidated into a uniform organization under the church government of the sovereign. Consequently the Placet (q.v.) for all kinds of papal bulls and briefs was renewed and strictly carried out. The bull *Unigenitus* was never to be mentioned, and the bull *In coena Domini* torn out of the books of liturgy. In 1781 all relations were broken off between the religious orders and their superiors and brethren in foreign countries. At the same time, the orders were subordinated to the disciplinary power of the bishops and archbishops. Similar ordinances were applied to the whole clergy. Communication with Rome was to be through Austrian ambassadors. Nobody was allowed to ask for papal titles in Rome, or to send money there. The bishops received the right to absolve and dispense, especially in matrimonial matters, and to institute new festivals, devotions, etc. Every appeal to Rome was forbidden. As at many points along the boundaries, Austrian dominions were under the authority of foreign bishops, a new circumscription of the dioceses was necessary. Moreover, the connection of the bishops with the secular ruler was made closer, closer even than that with the pope. There was demanded of them a new oath of subjection to the temporal ruler which preceded that to the pope. Nevertheless, there remained for the pope a certain privilege over the internal and external relations of the Austrian Church; and, when possible, the emperor tried to gain his consent to the ecclesiastical reforms.

3. Position of the Clergy in the State.

The special jurisdiction of the clergy was abolished, the clergy was subjected to the legislative and judicial powers, bishops were to wait for the placet for their consecration and the State assumed matrimonial legislation (1783). As it was the aim of Joseph to bring the clergy into closer connection with the Austrian State and make its representatives more efficient in their profession than had been possible under the old system, he placed their education in the hands of the central authority of civil instruction, the imperial commission of schools. The theological students were forbidden to visit the Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum in Rome (Nov. 18, 1781), which institution was replaced by a Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum in Pavia. In 1783 the theological schools in the monasteries were closed, and "general seminaries" were opened as State institutions under the superintendence of the imperial commission. As the monasteries were regarded as the chief seats of all sentiments inimical to the State, and as they deprived the State of a great number of efficient men that were urgently needed for the multitude of new parishes, a law of Jan. 12, 1782, ordered the dissolution of all religious orders not engaged in preaching, teaching, or nursing the sick. In this way the number of monasteries in Austria and Hungary was reduced from 2,163 to 1,425.

4. Reforms Affecting the Cure of Souls.

No less comprehensive, and evincing the same character, were the reforms relating to the internal life of the Church. The emperor made the greatest efforts to elevate the cure of souls and to adapt its organization to the needs of the changed conditions. Many of the monastic churches were transformed into parish churches. The emoluments of a religious State fund were used for the foundation of churches, pastorates, and chaplaincies; former monks were employed in pastoral work. At the same time Joseph deeply influenced the order of the church service. His aim was to do away with the merely external and mechanical practise of religion and further the ideal of the Enlightenment, the worship of God in spirit and in truth, and the practical love of fellow men. He paid special attention to preaching, to the instruction of youth, and to congregational singing. On Apr. 21, 1783, there was issued a new church order for Vienna, which served as a pattern for the whole country. All orders of service which went beyond the Roman ritual were done away. The Latin language was abolished, and the German introduced into the services. Rules were given with respect to the luxurious ornamentation of the churches, the magnificent processions, the brilliant illuminations, exhibition of relics, pilgrimages, etc. A rational and systematic care of the poor and sick was substituted for begging and the arbitrary giving of alms.

5. Religious Toleration Established.

An edict of Oct. 13, 1781, established religious toleration for the whole Hapsburg monarchy, for the German and Bohemian countries, Hungary and her dependencies, Italy, and the Netherlands. The adherents of the Augsburg and Helvetic confessions, as well as members of the Greek Church, obtained a limited freedom of worship. Each group of a hundred families was permitted to build a meeting-house, but without bells, steeples, or street entrances, and a school and employ their own teachers and subordinate pastors, who were to be confirmed by the emperor. Civil disqualifications arising from denominational differences were abolished. In German countries, Bohemia, and Moravia the number of non-Catholics in 1782 was 73,722. By 1788 this number had increased to 156,865. The number of tolerated congregations in Hungary and Transylvania in 1783 was 272; in 1784 it was 758. By collections in Austria and Hungary, in the empire, in the Evangelical Netherlands, in Switzerland, Denmark, and Russia, considerable sums were raised for the organization of Evangelical congregations. The government itself made efforts to establish order and develop the inner conditions of the Protestant churches. A special consistory was formed for the Protestants in Germany, Bohemia, and Moravia.

6. Successes and Failures of the Reforms.

It is self-evident that such an enormous revolution in all spheres met with the strongest opposition, especially from the Curia. On Mar. 22, 1782, Pius VI. paid a visit to Vienna to expostulate with the emperor; but he was received with cold politeness and returned without having accomplished his purpose. In the old countries of the Hapsburg crown the sentiment was very different. Among the bishops Joseph had friends and foes. The Febronian views of the Enlightenment (q.v.) were represented by the archbishop of Salzburg, as well as by the bishops of Königgrätz, Wiener Neustadt, Laibach, Seckau, etc., while the old ecclesiastical views were adhered to by the archbishop of Vienna and the Hungarian episcopate under the leadership of its primate. In the German and Bohemian countries the ecclesiastical reforms as a whole went through peacefully, though the changes in the cultus and in ecclesiastical ethics caused some bitterness. The political-social reforms pleased peasants and citizens, but aroused the opposition of the privileged classes. In Hungary the ecclesiastical reforms were carried out without opposition, but the political and social revolutions necessitated by the centralizing tendency of the emperor, as, for instance, the attempts to break the old constitution of Hungary and Transylvania, to govern the country in a despotic manner by State officers, to introduce German as the official language, and to abolish serfdom with the privileges of the nobility and the clergy, enraged the Magyar nobility in such a way that on Jan. 30, 1790, all political and social reforms had to be repealed. In the Netherlands the edict of toleration was promulgated November, 1781, and was carried out without difficulty, in spite of the opposition of the estates and the clergy. The other ecclesiastical provisions were opposed only by the clergy and the monastic orders. But here, too, the attempt to break the old feudal constitution, the self-government of the estates and the privileged position of the clergy and nobility in city and country, met in 1787 with the most violent opposition in all prominent circles. On Jan. 7, 1790, the provinces declared themselves independent, and the general political condition deprived the emperor of all hope of victory. Disappointed and defeated he died the following month. There is no doubt that the impatience and haste of his reforms greatly injured his work, and yet his reign became the starting-point for a new and higher development of Austria. The system of ecclesiastical legislation continued after his death, except that in the Netherlands his brother and successor Leopold was compelled to sacrifice all ecclesiastical innovations, even the edict of toleration, in order to regain his provinces. In Hungary and Transylvania the main bulk of the ecclesiastical reforms, and especially the edict of toleration, remained in force. In Austria most of the estates required the restitution of the old feudal conditions and the old domination of the Roman Catholic Church; but Leopold refused both. Of the ecclesiastical legislation only the " general seminaries " were discontinued. The bishops were allowed to erect their own institutions and to dispose of the order of church service. The great mass of reforms within the Church remained until 1848. At the time of Napoleon I. Josephinism extended over all the South German states, Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden, and Hesse. It was only in 1848 that it was entirely broken in Austria, as well as in the South German states. Only the edict of toleration remained in force in Austria, and was embodied in the constitution.

(Karl Müller.)

Bibliography: Sources are: A. von Arneth, *Maria Theresia und Joseph II., ihre Korrespondenz*, 3 vols., Vienna, 1867; J. Kropatschek, *Handbuch . . . Verordnungen und Gesetze*, 19 vols., Vienna, 1785–91; *Codex juris ecclesiastici Josephini*, 2 vols., Presburg, 1788; *Sammlung der Verordnungen und Gesetze Kaisers Joseph II.*, 10 vols., Vienna, 1788. Consult: K. Ritter, *Kaiser Joseph und seine kirchlichen Reformen*, 2 vols., Regensburg, 1867; S. Brunner, *Die theologische Dienerschaft am Hofe Josephs II.*, Vienna, 1868; idem, *Die Mysterien der Aufklärung in Oesterreich 1770–1800*, ib. 1869; T. von Kern, *Die Reformen der Kaiserin Maria Theresia*, Leipsic, 1869; A. Wolf, *Die Aufhebung der Klöster in Innerösterreich*, Vienna, 1871; idem, *Oesterreich unter Maria Theresia, Joseph II., und Leopold II.*, Berlin, 1883; E. Friedberg, *Die Grenzen zwischen Staat und Kirche*, Tübingen, 1872; A. von Arneth, *Geschichte Maria Theresia*, ix. 1–260, Vienna, 1879; C. von Hock, *Der österreichische Staatsrath 1760–1848*, ib., 1879; E. Hubert, *La Condition des protestants en Belgique depuis Charles V. jusquà Joseph II.*, Brussels, 1882; G. Frank, *Das Toleranzpatent Kaisers Joseph II.*, Vienna, 1882; L. Leger, *Hist. of Austro-Hungary*, London, 1889; H. Schlitter, *Die Regierung Josefs II.*, vol. i., Vienna, 1900; F. Frishc, *Kaiser Joseph II.*, ib. 1903; J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, New York, 1904; F. Geier, *Die Durchführung der kirchlichen Reformen Josephs II.*, Stuttgart, 1905; E. Gothein, *Der Breisgau unter Maria Theresia und Joseph II.*, Heidelberg, 1907; H. Franz, *Studien zur kirchlichen Reform Josephs II.*, 1908.

JOSEPHUS, FLAVIUS.

I. Life.
II. Works.
  " Jewish War " and " Antiquities " (§ 1).
  Remaining Works (§ 2).
  Editions (§ 3).

I. Life: Flavius Josephus, the Jewish historian, was born in the first year of the reign of Caligula, 37–38 A.D.; d. at Rome after 100 A.D. His father Matthias belonged to a respected family of priests in Jerusalem. Josephus reports proudly that at the age of sixteen he went through the three " philosophical schools " of the Jews, those of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, and that for the next three years he lived with a hermit named Banus. At the age of nineteen he publicly joined the Pharisees (*Vita*, i.–ii.). In 64 A.D. he undertook a journey to Rome to obtain the release of certain imprisoned priests. He had hardly returned to Palestine when the great insurrection against the Romans broke out (66 A.D.). In the beginning Josephus was without doubt opposed to the rebellion, but after the first victories of the Jews, he, too, joined it, more by force than by free will; he even became commander in Galilee. As such he organized in the winter of 66–67 the military forces of Galilee and made preparations for the campaign which began in the spring of 67. Activities centered around the fortress of Jotapata, which was for six weeks bravely and cleverly defended by Josephus against the army of Vespasian. After the capture of Jotapata he became a prisoner of the Romans; after the second year of his imprisonment he was released by Vespasian, who in 69 had become emperor. He then adopted the name of Flavius Josephus and devoted the remainder of his life to the interest of the Flavian emperors. He accompanied Vespasian to Alexandria, returned thence in the suite of Titus to Palestine and was in the army of the latter during the whole siege of Jerusalem in the year 70. After the capture of Jerusalem Titus took him to Rome, where he seems to have settled down to literary work. Vespasian gave him a dwelling-place in his own former residence, made him a Roman citizen, and presented him with an annual salary and a considerable tract of land in Judea. With the following emperors, Titus (79–81 A.D.) and Domitian (81–96 A.D.), Josephus enjoyed the same favor. It is not known how long he lived and in what relation he stood to the later emperors. He must have been living in the time of Trajan, since in his *Vita* he mentions King Agrippa II. as having already died (100 A.D.).

II. Works: The works of Josephus were all composed in the Greek language, with the exception of his first draft of the "Jewish War," which was in Aramaic.

1. "Jewish War" and "Antiquities."

His principal purpose was to communicate to the Greco-Roman world the knowledge of the history of his people, whom he defends and glorifies in every possible way. The "History of the Jewish War," in seven books, is his earliest and most carefully written work. The first and second books gave a survey of Jewish history from the time of the Maccabees to the outbreak of the insurrection against the Romans. The rest of the work is a detailed account of the war from the beginning in 66 to the complete suppression in 73. It was written late in the reign of Vespasian (69 to 79 A.D.; cf. *War*, preface, chap. i.; *Ant.*, preface, chap. i.). It was presented to Vespasian, Titus, and Agrippa II., and the author received commendation for the accuracy of his account. The "Antiquities" ("Jewish Archeology") is a comprehensive history of the Jewish people from the beginnings of Biblical history to the outbreak of the war in 66 A.D., in twenty books, after the model of the *Romaikē archaiologia* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. It was completed in the thirteenth year of Domitian, 93–94 A.D. For the Biblical period (books I.–XI.) Josephus draws almost exclusively from the Bible in the Septuagint version, but he modifies the Biblical story and supplements it by legends, following current traditions. Here and there he seems to have employed also Hellenistic compilations of Biblical history, especially those of Demetrius and Artapanus. Finally, he inserted notices from Greek writers of profane history when he dealt, for instance, with the flood, with primitive man, with Phenician history, and the like. The post-Biblical period of Jewish history is treated by Josephus without any due sense of proportion according to the condition of his sources. He has little to say on the period from Alexander the Great to the time of the Maccabees, filling the gap with an extensive extract from Pseudo-Aristeas (see ARISTEAS) on the origin of the Greek translation of the Bible. For the history of the Maccabees (175–135 B.C.) he had an excellent source in I Maccabees (see APOCRYPHA, A, IV., 9), which he supplemented from the works of Polybius. The later history of the Hasmoneans seems to depend upon the more general works of Strabo and Nicolas of Damascus. The main source for the history of Herod (books XV.–XVII.) was Nicolaus Damascenus, who, as an intimate councilor of Herod, was acquainted with the internal history of the court and described in great detail the history of his land. The history from the death of Herod to the outbreak of the war (books XVIII.–XX.) is treated quite meagerly. For the last decades Josephus was able to draw from oral information or from his own experience. He inserted a number of documents—decrees of the Roman senate, letters of Roman magistrates, decrees of cities of Asia Minor under Roman influence, and the like—the majority of these dating from the time of Cæsar and Augustus and having high value. The genuineness of the passage on Jesus Christ (XVIII., iii. 3) is generally given up.

The title affixed to the autobiography (*Vita*) of Josephus is misleading, since it recounts and justifies his activity in Galilee in the winter of 66–67 A.D.

2. Remaining Works.

In this work Josephus attacks especially Justus of Tiberias, who, being a man of conservative tendencies, had, like Josephus, joined the insurrection more by force than by free will and had subsequently tried to exonerate himself for participation in the rebellion and to place the responsibility upon Josephus. The latter retaliated in his *Vita* by representing Justus as the chief agitator and himself as the real friend of the Romans. The work was written after the death of Agrippa II., therefore after 100 A.D. The *Contra Apionem* presents a well-written systematic apology for Judaism in reply to various attacks, especially in the literary world. The usual title *Contra Apionem* is misleading, since only a part of the work is occupied with the polemic against Apion. Porphyry (*De abstinentia*, iv. 11) quotes it under the title *Pros tous Hellēnas*, the oldest Church Fathers under the title *Peri tēs tōn Joudaiōn archaiotētos.* Jerome was the first to use the title *Contra Apionem.* Since Josephus quotes in this work the "Antiquities" it must have been written later than 93 A.D. That IV Maccabees was wrongly ascribed by the Fathers to Josephus is now universally recognized. Similarly the work discussed in Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 48, under the title *Peri tou pantos* or *Peri tēs tou pantos aitias* or *Peri tēs tou pantos ousias*, is of Christian origin and is quoted by the author of the *Philosophumena* as his own. The author of both is most probably Hippolytus, among whose works there is mentioned one entitled *Peri tou pantos*. A work projected by Josephus on theology seems never to have been written.

3. Editions.

The first edition of the Greek text of the works of Josephus was published by Frobenius and Episcopius (Basel, 1544). It was followed by the Geneva editions of 1611 and 1634, and by the edition of Ittig (Leipsic, 1691). A text of the complete works, revised after manuscripts, was furnished by Hudson (2 vols., Oxford, 1720). Then came the editions of Havercamp (2 vols., Amsterdam, Leyden, Utrecht, 1726), of Oberthür (3 vols., Leipic, 1782–1785), and of Richter (6 vols., Leipsic, 1826–27). On the basis of Havercamp's material the text was revised by Dindorf (2 vols., Paris, 1845–47). This was followed by the pocket edition of Bekker (6 vols., Leipsic, 1855–56). A comprehensive collation of all good manuscripts was made only in recent times by Niese; his efforts resulted in a critical edition which by the richness of the apparatus far excels all former editions (*Flavii Josephi opera edidit et apparatu critico instruxit Benedictus Niese*, 6 vols., Berlin, 1887–94; vol. vii. is a carefully compiled index, 1895). On the basis of Niese's apparatus appeared an edition by Naber (6 vols., Leipsic, 1888–96). There exists an early Latin translation of the complete works of Josephus, with the exception of the *Vita*. Cassiodorus seems to be the author of the Latin translation of the "Antiquities" and of the *Contra Apionem*. The first printed edition of the Latin Josephus was published by Johann Schüssler in Augsburg, 1470. Since then until the appearance of the first Greek edition it has been printed frequently, and the later editions were frequently corrected after the Greek. A critical edition of the Latin version, resting upon a comprehensive use of the sources, was begun by Boysen as vol. xxxvii. of the Vienna *CSEL* (Vienna, 1898). With the Latin translation of the *Bellum Judaicum* is not to be confounded a Latin condensation which is known under the name of Egesippus or Hegesippus. The name Egesippus is only a corruption from Josippus, a Latin form of "Josephus." The work has some original additions, dates from the second half of the fourth century A.D., and has been doubtfully ascribed to Ambrose. The first edition appeared in Paris, 1510; a critically revised text appeared under the title *Hegesippus qui dicitur sive Egesippus de bello Judaico ope codicis Casellani recognitus, ed. Weber, opus morte Weberi interruptum absolvit Caesar* (Marburg, 1864). Under the name Josippon or Joseph, son of Gorion, there exists a history of the Jewish people to the destruction of Jerusalem, in the form of a compendium written in Hebrew, which is in the main excerpted from Josephus, but in many respects differs widely from him. There appeared an edition of it with a Latin translation, by J F. Breithaupt (Gotha, 1707, 1710). Since the sixteenth century the works of Josephus have been translated into almost all modern European languages. Among the English translations Traill's, giving the *Vita* and the *War*, are especially esteemed (London, 1862). [The standard English translation has long been that of W. Whiston (London, 1737, often reproduced, latest ed. by D. S. Margoliouth, 1906). Others were by T. Lodge (1602, and often); Sir R. L. l'Estrange (1702 and often); J. Court (1733, and often); E. Thompson and W. C. Price (2 vols., 1777–78); and T. Bradshaw (1792)]. (E. SCHÜRER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best discussion is in Schürer, *Geschichte*, i. 74–106, 607–613, iii. 370, Eng. transl. I., i. 77–82, ii. 214–223, II. iii. 221–222, Schürer furnishes very abundant material in the original article in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, ix. 377 sqq. A very full discussion is to be found in *DCB*, iii. 441–460. The older material is suggested in Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, v. 49–56. Consult further: V. E. P. Chasles, *De l'autorité historique de Flavius Josèphe*, Paris, 1841; Creuzer, in *TSK*, xxvi (1853), 45–86, 906–928; Reuss, in *Revue de théologie*, 1859, pp. 253–319; W. A. Terwogt, *Het Leven van . . . Flavius Josephus*, Utrecht, 1863; R. Nicolai, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, ii. 2, pp. 553–559, Magdeburg, 1877; A. von Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*, iv. 336–384, Leipsic, 1893; C. Wachsmuth, *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte*, pp. 438–449, ib. 1895; Niese, in *Historische Zeitschrift*, lxxvi (1896), 193–237; Unger, in *SMA*, philosophisch-philologische Klasse, 1895, pp. 551–604, 1896, pp. 357–397, 1897, pp. 189–244; H. Peter, *Die geschichtliche Literatur über die römische Kaiserzeit*, i. 394–401, Leipsic, 1897; P. Krüger, *Philo und Josephus als Apologeten des Judentums*, ib. 1906; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, i. 314–327.

JOSHUA, jesh'yu-ɑ: An Ephraimite, son of Nun, servant and helper of Moses (Ex. xxiv. 13), and his successor in the leadership of Israel (Num. xxvii. 18–23). On assuming the leadership, Joshua sent spies who were entertained by Rahab in Jericho, and on their return reported the situation in Canaan (Josh. i. 10–ii. 24). He then ordered preparations to be made for the invasion, which took place on the tenth day of the first month of the forty-first year after the exodus from Egypt. It has been said that Joshua used the fords of the Jordan; but the place and the season of the year are unfavorable to this supposition, since at that time the Jordan overflows its banks (Josh. iii. 15; I Chron. xii. 15). According to the narrative the upper waters of the river stayed as if dammed up, while the lower waters flowed off into the Dead Sea. The suggestion of Klostermann that the phenomenon may have been caused by a severe earthquake which raised the bed of the river or produced a landslide across the river bed, which was afterward carried away by the flood, offers a natural explanation of the way in which the river was crossed dry-footed. To preserve the memory of this crossing, the leader had twelve stones carried from the bed of the river and set up at Gilgal, midway between the river and Jericho (Josh. iv. 1–8, 20–24). The people were then circumcised and the feast of the Passover was celebrated. The promise made to Joshua that Yahweh, the leader of the host of the people which had become Yahweh's, would be his helper was fulfilled in the taking of Jericho, the walls of which were thrown down in an earthquake (Josh. v. 13–xxx. vi.), while of the inhabitants only Rahab and her family were saved alive. The punishment of Achan and the treaty secured by the Gibeonites' device followed. According to Deut. xxvii., after the capture of Ai

Joshua led the people in a northerly direction to Ebal and Gerizim, and overcame a combination of Canaanites gathered to punish Gibeon for its treaty with Israel, on which occasion occurred what has been read as a miracle in the staying of the sun and the moon in their courses, to be interpreted probably as a subjective effect of the quickness and completeness of the victory (Josh. x. 1–14). This was followed by the conquest of the southern part of the land as far as Kadesh-barnea and westward to Gaza (Josh. x. 29 sqq.), succeeded by a third campaign in which the kings of the northern cities were subdued near Merom. While by these wars the country was won, with the exception of the Philistine and Phenician coast, not all was actually in the possession of the Hebrews; and several years after the ending of the campaigns Joshua's seat of government was still at Gilgal (Josh. xiv. 6).

It was at this place that Joshua's second task was begun—the division of the land among the tribes. Judah, Ephraim, and Manasseh first received their allotments, and the ark was carried from Gilgal to Shiloh in Benjamin (Josh. xv.–xviii. 1). This was followed by the allotment of the portions to the other tribes, and the permission to the East-Jordan tribes to return to their own district, having fulfilled their duty to the tribes west of the river (Josh. xviii.–xxii.). In anticipation of his death Joshua gathered first the elders and then the people at Shechem to receive his last instructions, which he commemorated by a pillar or stone under the terebinth at Shechem (Josh. xxiv. 26–27). He died at the age of one hundred and ten. (W. VOLCK†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. H. Stähelin, in *TSK*, xxiv (1849), 394 sqq.; J. Sockel, *Die Eroberung des heiligen Landes durch Josua*, Gleiwitz, 1870; J. B. Meyer, *Joshua and the Land of Promise*, London, 1893; and the literature under JOSHUA, BOOK OF.

JOSHUA, BOOK OF: The sixth of the books of the Old Testament in the arrangement of the English Bible. According to the Hebrew canon, it is the first book of the second part, containing the prophetical-historical books. It was originally the conclusion of the Pentateuch. The conception of the Talmud (*Baba bathra*, 14b) that Joshua was the author of the book is no longer tenable; nor is that of Keil, who regarded it as a unified book drawn up by an eye-witness of the events (cf. Josh. v. 1, R.V., margin). For contents see HEXATEUCH, § 2. The part which deals with the conquest bears the impress of those sections of the Pentateuch derived from JE (hardly to be distinguished in this book); the second part resembles more the style of the priestly writer, but with insertions of JE (xviii. 3–10). But throughout, these elements are more or less interwoven, with Deuteronomic portions also thrown in (especially in viii.; cf. viii. 30 sqq., with Deut. iv. 41–43, and note the Deuteronomic expressions in Josh. xxiii. 5, 11, 14). There are also expressions which linguistically belong neither to JE nor P, indicating that the redactor has employed other material: such are the combinations "the Lord, the God of Israel" (fourteen times, only elsewhere in the Hexateuch in Ex. v. 1, xxxii. 27), and the term "mighty men of valor" (Josh. i. 14, etc.). Thus the work of several hands is distinguishable in the composition of the book. It appears from analysis that the parts belonging to P are later than those which are assigned to JE; and that JE and P lay before the Deuteronomist who composed the book found in the times of Josiah. It was he who closed the Pentateuch and made Joshua the beginning of the historical narrative, reediting it and working it over, but bestowing upon it no such care as he exercised upon the Pentateuch. There are indications that its text has had an independent history.

Contents and Sources.

In the book data are found which tend to fix the date of the sources out of which it was compiled or from which it was derived. Thus chap. viii. 28 must have been written long prior to Isa. x. 28; xvi. 10 must be earlier than the beginning of Solomon's reign (I Kings ix. 16); xv. 63 must precede the incident told in II Sam. v. 6; x. 13 can not be earlier than the time of David, since the book of Jasher contained David's elegy on Saul and Jonathan; vi. 25 and xiv. 14 do not imply that the source was contemporary with Rahab and Joshua, since the reference is to the descendants of Rahab and Caleb. That the part dealing with the division of the land rests on documents is in itself probable (cf. xviii. 9); and the absence of reports of strife over tribal boundaries implies that the boundaries were based on an old decision. The list of kings, xii. 9 sqq., is regarded by Ewald as an old document. But variations in, e.g., the count of cities shows that the text has not remained unaltered (xv. 32, xix. 15, 38). This book with the first four books of the Pentateuch and parts of Deuteronomy was known to the prophets Hosea, Amos, and Micah. Thus the general scheme of history regarded by Micah as known to his contemporaries under Hezekiah agrees with that presented in Numbers and Joshua (Micah vi. 1 sqq., which recalls the narrative of JE). So in Amos there are reminiscences of the narrative of P (as in ii. 10, v. 25, vii. 4; cf. particularly ii. 7 with Lev. xx. 3, xxii. 2, 32). So Hos. xii. 4 may be compared with Gen. xxxv. 9 sqq., in which minutiæ of agreement suggest that Hosea had the report of P before him.

Historicity.

The credibility of the narrative of the book has been assailed on the ground that it contains not history but legend. The chief occasion for this is comparison with Judges i. It is said that while Joshua implies the conquest of Canaan by the tribes in unison, Judges i. records the piecemeal occupation by individual tribes or aggregations. But Judges i. 1 professes to deal with what occurred after the death of Joshua, not with the events of his life. Moreover, while the general impression which the book of Joshua gives is that of a complete conquest, its individual expressions limit this (xxiii. 7, 12). Thus at Joshua's death no tribe had fully completed the conquest of the portion allotted to it, and especially the fortresses and plains remained in Canaanitic possession. Thus Judges i. appears as the story of the continuation of the subjugation of the land, and there is no contradiction between that chapter and the account in Joshua. The credibility is also attacked on the ground that the narrative concerning the East-Jordan tribes is unnatural. Similarly the narrative of the division is assailed, needlessly, since the prospective nature of the division is implied in the allotment of the Philistine and Phenician coastland, which was not conquered. The objection urged because of the miracles stands upon the same ground as objections to the supernatural in other books of Scripture. As Israel's origin is to be distinguished from that of other peoples, so is the shaping of its subsequent history.

The relation of the book of Joshua to Judges is such that the latter appears in several cases to have borrowed from the former. The Septuagint has at the close of Joshua an addition, partly apocryphal and partly derived from the book of Judges, to the effect that the Israelites of that time changed the location of the ark, that Phinehas succeeded his father Eleazar in the priesthood and was buried in his father's grave, and that Israel worshiped the gods of the people who surrounded them and were under the dominion of Eglon, king of Moab, eighteen years. (W. Volck†.)

For the Samaritan book of Joshua see Samaria, Samaritans.

Bibliography: Commentaries are: C. Steuernagel, Göttingen, 1900; F. J. B. Maurer, Stuttgart, 1831; C. F. Keil, Erlangen, 1847, 1874, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1857; A. Knobel, Leipsic, 1861; T. E. Espin, in *Bible Commentary*, London, 1872; H. Crosby, New York, 1875; G. A. McLeod, Cambridge, 1878; J. J. Lias, in *Pulpit Commentary*, London, 1881; C. F. A. Dillmann, Leipsic, 1886; J. Lloyd, London, 1886; J. S. Black, Cambridge, 1891; S. Oettli, Munich, 1893; W. H. Bennett, in *SBOT*, Baltimore, 1895; F. W. Spurling, London, 1901. Questions of criticism are discussed in: J. E. Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby, *The Pentateuch*, London, 1900; L. König, *Alttestamentliche Studien*, vol. i., Meurs, 1836 (decides the book a unit and Joshua its author); J. W. Colenso, *The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua critically Examined*, London, 1862–71; Himpel, in *TQS*, 1864–65; J. Hollenberg, in *TSK*, xlvii (1874), 462–506; idem, *Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Josua*, Meurs, 1876; K. Budde, in *ZATW*, vii (1887), pp. 93 sqq.; E. Albers, *Die Quellenberichte in Josua i.–xii.*, Bonn, 1890; *DB*, ii. 779–788; *EB*, ii. 2600–2609; *JE*, vii. 284–288; and the various works cited under Biblical Introduction, and the pertinent sections in works on the history of Israel given under Ahab.

JOSIAH, jo-sɑi′ɑ̄: Fifteenth king of Judah, son and successor of Amon. His dates, according to the old chronology, are 641–610 B.C., according to Kautzsch, 640–609 B.C., and he became king at the age of eight years. The detailed accounts of his reign (II Kings xxii–xxiii; II Chron. xxxiv.–xxxv.) begin with his eighteenth year; the Chronicler's remark in II., xxxiv. 3 probably depends upon II Kings xxiii. 4 sqq. According to II Kings xxii. 3 sqq., Josiah ordered the temple to be repaired, which had probably not been done since the reign of Joash (II Kings xii. 11 sqq.) and Hilkiah the priest then reported that he had found in the temple the book of the law. Its contents so overwhelmed the king with apprehensions of evil that he rent his clothes, and an oracle was sought from Huldah the prophetess, who reported that the threatenings were to be realized, since the book was true. The king then summoned to Jerusalem the elders of the people, the priests, and the prophets ("priests and Levites," II Chron. xxxiv. 30), and to them the book was read. There followed a thorough cleansing of the temple and city of the accessories to idolatrous worship, and to this was added abolition of the worship on the high places, while the priests of that service were brought to the capital, where, though excluded from service at the sanctuary, they received the emoluments of their order. Josiah then turned his attention to high places in what had been the northern kingdom, especially to that at Bethel, and they were defiled with the bones of the dead. The work was concluded by a notable observance of the Passover rendered memorable apparently by the numbers and unity of those celebrating.

The historic value of the reports about the reform of the cultus is bound up with the question as to what the law book was which was discovered, and can be solved only in connection with criticism of the Pentateuch (see Hexateuch). In case this book was not one which had been lost to sight, but was an unknown and new codification having for its purpose the abolition of worship at the high places and concentration of worship at Jerusalem, the conclusion is forced that it was practically identical with Deuteronomy; but it does not follow that the transaction was due to Hilkiah and the prophets of that time, while priestly interests were not served by the publication of the book. The noteworthy fact is the forcible impression it made upon Josiah and his contemporaries and its bearing upon the Josianic reformation. The results were important for the history of Israel, since the unity of cult had symbolic relation to the monotheistic conception of deity. Josiah's reform created a new basis for the activity of the prophets, it affected worship in the second temple, and set forth the unity of God as the center of thought in the religion of Israel. The questions arise, with what right did Josiah extend his efforts in behalf of a pure cultus into the northern kingdom, and why did he throw himself across the path of Pharaoh Necho when the latter was on his way to the Euphrates. While the northern region was nominally under the rule of Assyria, that power was about to fall. The time would seem ripe for what had been foretold by the prophets, the unification of Israel and Judah, and religious unification was the first step toward political reunion. Such a plan he might hope to carry through as a loyal vassal of Babylonia, especially in withstanding the attempts of Egypt to gain new position as a world power. But the issue did not correspond to his hopes, and Josiah was defeated and killed, and brought back for burial to Jerusalem. Some debate has arisen over the place of the battle, since Herodotus (ii. 159) names instead of the Biblical Megiddo Magdolus, which corresponds to the modern al-Majdal, two miles west of Carmel or (Winckler, in Benzinger, *Die Bücher der Könige*, p. 207, Tübingen, 1899) Strato's Tower. Possibly Megiddo appears in the Biblical narrative because it was the place to which the wounded king was carried and where he died. Yet it hardly seems as though the Jews could have completely lost the correct tradition. Another and somewhat variant report appears in II Chron. xxxv. 22 sqq., according to which the remonstrance of Necho takes the form of an oracle from God, makes Josiah put on a disguise, and when wounded has him carried to Jerusalem with the implication that he died there (on holy ground?); the Chronicler tells also of a lament of Jeremiah for Josiah and a collection of dirges in his memory, with which Jer. xxii. 10 and Zech. xii. 11 may be brought into connection, perhaps as indicating a yearly memorial celebration.

(E. KAUTZSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The pertinent sections in the literature mentioned under AHAB; the articles in the Bible dictionaries; the literature under HEXATEUCH, since the discussions of Deuteronomy and of the Pentateuch involve discussions of Josiah's reform and its legal basis.

JOST, yəst, **ISAAK MARCUS:** German Jewish historian; b. at Bernburg (23 m. s. of Magdeburg) Feb. 22, 1793; d. at Frankfort Nov. 22, 1860. He studied at the Samson school at Wolfenbüttel, at the gymnasium at Brunswick, and at the universities of Göttingen and Berlin (Ph.D., 1816), became principal of the Bock school in Berlin in 1826, and in 1835 was called to the Jewish Realschule (Philanthropin) at Frankfort. His principal works are, *Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Maccabäer bis auf unsere Tage* (10 vols., Berlin, 1820–47); *Allgemeine Geschichte des israelitischen Volkes* (2 vols., 1831–32); a German translation of the Mishnah, with Hebrew commentary (6 vols., 1832–34); and *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Sekten* (3 vols., Leipsic, 1857–59). He also prepared school text-books, wrote political tracts in the interest of Judaism, made many contributions to the Jewish press, and to almanacs and year-books, edited the *Israelitische Annalen*, 1839–1841, and, in collaboration with Michael Creizenach, edited *Zion*, 1841–42. He holds high rank as historian, though he has been criticized for his rationalistic attitude toward the narratives in the Talmudic sources.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *JE*, vii. 296–297, where further literature is given.

JOTHAM, jō′tham: **1.** The youngest son of Gideon (Jerubbaal), who alone escaped the massacre of the Gideon family by his half-brother Abimelech, uttered his famous parable of the trees which sought a king, and then fled to Beer (Judges ix. 5–21).

2. Tenth king of Judah, son and successor of Uzziah. His dates, according to the old chronology, are 756–740 B.C., according to Peake (*DB*, ii. 789) 751–735 B.C. Confusion in the chronology of Israel is marked about this period, since II Kings xv. 30 assigns to Jotham at least twenty years, while data from the Assyrian annals allow only twelve years for his reign and that of Ahaz. It is supposed that the regnal years accredited to Jotham include those of his regency during his father's disability. Of his reign little is reported in the Book of Kings except that he "built the higher gate of the house of the Lord." The Chronicler adds that he built much of the wall of Ophel, also cities and fortresses; and that he subdued the Ammonites and imposed a heavy tribute upon them. The Book of Kings notes also that in his days the coalition between Syria and Israel against Judah began to be effective, the object being apparently to force Judah into the combination against the Assyrians, who were beginning to press heavily upon the Mediterranean region. The time seemed ripe for such plans, since Tiglath-Pileser was at the time engaged in the East. The great prophet of the times was Isaiah, and the picture in Isa. ii. 5 indicates that, in spite of apparent prosperity in the land, the internal conditions were not favorable. (E. KAUTZSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: 1. The commentaries on Judges, particularly those by Moore and Budde.

2. Sources are: II Kings xv. 5, 32–38; II Chron. xxvii. Consult the pertinent sections in the literature given under AHAB, and the articles in the Bible dictionaries.

JOVIANUS, jō″vî-ā′nʊs, **FLAVIUS CLAUDIUS:** Roman emperor; b. at Singidunum (the modern Belgrade, Servia) about 331; d. at Dadastana, Bithynia (125 m. e.s.e. of Constantinople) in the night between Feb. 16 and 17, 364. Taking part in the campaign against the Persians, as ranking officer of the palace troops, in the crisis following the death of Julian he was hastily elected emperor by the army in sight of the enemy, June 27, 363. The fact that Jovian was a Christian and had withstood attempts during the reign of Julian to render him apostate seems to have played no part in his election. The newly elected emperor, in view of the military and political situation of the time, was induced to conclude an inglorious peace with the Persians, giving up to them the eastern outskirts of the empire, including the important city of Nisibis. On his return from the East at Antioch Jovian publicly stated his attitude in regard to the controversies in the Church. He took the side of the Nicene party and their leader Athanasius, urging the latter in a written appeal to resume his episcopal see at Alexandria and asking to be remembered in his prayers. He commanded Athanasius, who visited him at Antioch, to issue a new statement of the orthodox creed, and thus his authority certainly influenced the controversies regarding the nature of Christ, although he tried to hold aloof from them officially. His aim was to restore matters as they were before the reign of Julian, and so he replaced on the army standards and on the coins the monogram of Christ, recalled the bishops from exile, renewed the privileges of the Church and of the clergy, widows, and virgins, and restored the donations of corn. He imposed the death penalty on whosoever married a virgin or a widow who had taken the vows, even with the woman's consent, and forbade the inheritance of their parents' property by the children of such an union. Yet he also showed much tolerance toward pagans. VICTOR SCHULTZE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: V. Schultze, *Geschichte des Unterganges des griechisch-römischen Heidentums*, i. 176 sqq., Jena, 1887; H. Richter, *Das weströmische Reich*, pp. 168 sqq., Berlin, 1865; H. Schiller, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, ii. 344 sqq., 1887; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ii. 506, 517 sqq.; Neander, *Christian Church*, ii. 87–89 et passim; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 60; the literature under JOVINIANUS, and De la Bleterie, *Hist. de l'empereur Jovien*, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1740.

JOVINIAN: A "heretic" who became conspicuous in Rome after 385 as a polemical writer against undue valuation of the celibate and ascetic life. Prior to this time he had lived in celibacy as a strict ascetic, but coincidently with his appearance in public he modified his ascetic living, allowing himself indulgence in flesh food, wearing better clothing, visiting the baths, and by no means shunning association with youths and women. Nevertheless he stayed single, deeming this estate the one divinely enjoined for him. He lived quite after the manner of the pre-monastic, Western ascetics, and may be considered an advocate of the ancient ascetic régime, which waged a desperate battle in Rome against the new and intensified forms of Oriental monasticism. In this process he came to certain fundamental conclusions that stood opposed to theories which had long been shared by the Church. As a consequence of his agitation against monasticism, many men and women gave up the celibate life. That frivolous natures also attached themselves to Jovinian, considering him an advocate of relaxed Christian morality, may easily be believed on the testimony of Jerome. The Roman Bishop Siricius, in deference to denunciation by the monastic circle at Rome, excommunicated Jovinian and his followers in 390, and forwarded the decision to foreign bishops, in particular to Ambrose of Milan. Jovinian having betaken himself with his most loyal adherents to Milan, Ambrose made haste to excommunicate him in 391; and Jerome, about 392, by instigation of his Roman friends, wrote two books against him. Since these, however, were considered somewhat too polemical, Jerome sought to soften their tone without really yielding (*Epist.*, xlviii.–li). The strife revived again at Milan, and Ambrose wrote a warning against Jovinian's heretical doctrines (*Epist.*, lxxxiii.). Augustine wrote the tract *De bono conjugali* against the Jovinian heresy, but without expressly naming Jovinian. He was dead in 406 (Jerome, *Adv. Vigilantium*, i.).

Jovinian's doctrinal views are known only through the writings of his opponents, who have transmitted some of his theses verbatim, but as regards the inner connection of thought, we are limited to hypothetical constructions. He wrote a work which Jerome calls *commentarioli*, seeking to adduce Scriptural evidences for his theses, but by no means excluding support from profane literature. His doctrines all converge upon opposition to monasticism. In the letters of Siricius two erroneous teachings of Jovinian are named. According to the first, virgins, widows, and married people, baptized in Christ, have equal merit, save in so far as otherwise they differ in respect to their works; and, secondly, fasting is nowise better, more meritorious and pleasing to God than the enjoyment of food, observed with thanksgiving. In the synodal decision of Ambrose at Milan, two other erroneous teachings are attributed to Jovinian; viz., that he denied the inviolate virginity of Mary, and a difference in the celestial reward of the righteous. In combating the growing dogma of the unimpaired virginity of Mary, wherein the monks were especially interested for the glorification of celibacy, Jovinian desired to deal a stinging blow on the followers of monasticism. He adhered to the virgin birth of Jesus, but affirmed that by bringing to birth, Mary ceased to be virgin. As a deduction from the parity of marriage and virginity, Jovinian appears to have advanced another proposition transmitted by Jerome; viz., that all the regenerate who have preserved their baptismal grace receive the same recompense in the kingdom of heaven, irrespectively of their having lived in the married estate or as virgins. In the light of these thoughts, the last and most difficult proposition of Jovinian becomes intelligible. He affirmed the essential sinlessness of the regenerate. How he expanded this proposition in detail is not known. On the strength of this tenet, Jerome related him theologically to Pelagius; Julian of Eclanum classed him with Augustine; and Augustine, in turn, associated him with Pelagianism. G. GRÜTZMACHER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: Jerome, *Adversus Jovinianum*, and *Epist.*, xlviii.–l., Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2d ser., vi. 66–82, 334–345; Augustine, *Haer.*, chap. lxxxii.; Siricius, *Epist. ii. ad diversos episcopos*, in Mansi, *Concilia*, iii. 663 sqq.; Ambrose, *Epist.*, viii., lxxxiii., in Mansi, *Concilia*, i. 669 sqq., v. 554 sqq. Consult: G. B. Lindner, *De Joviniano et Vigilantio*, Leipsic, 1839; J. H. Blunt, *Dictionary of Sects and Heresies*, pp. 242–244, Philadelphia, 1874; W. Haller, *Jovinianus*, Leipsic, 1897; G. Grützmacher, *Hieronymus*, ii. 145–172, Berlin, 1906; *DCB*, iii. 465–466.

JOWETT, jau′et, **BENJAMIN:** English educator and author; b. in the parish of Camberwell, London, Apr. 15, 1817; d. at Headley Park, Liphook (22 m. e. of Winchester), Hampshire, Oct. 1, 1893. He studied at St. Paul's School, London, and at Balliol College, Oxford (B.A., 1839; M.A., 1842), where he was elected fellow in 1838. In 1837 he won the Hertford university scholarship for Latin, and in 1841 the chancellor's prize for the Latin essay. He was ordained deacon in 1842, priest in 1845. In 1842 he was appointed to a tutorship at Balliol, which he held till he became master of the college in 1870. He was public examiner in classics 1849–51, and 1853. At Oxford he had fallen into the very midst of the Tractarian movement, and his Evangelical views were shaken by daily intercourse with his friend William George Ward (q.v.). In after years he said, "But for the providence of God, I might have become a Roman Catholic." A more lasting influence, however, was that of A. P. Stanley, the leader of the Broad Church school, with whom Jowett traveled and studied in Germany in the summers of 1845 and 1846. On being defeated for the mastership of Balliol in 1854, Jowett, in his disappointment, took up with renewed energy a work that he and Stanley had projected on St. Paul, and published *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans: with Critical Notes and Dissertations* (2 vols., London, 1855). This work brought forth a storm of protest from conservative quarters; and when, in the same year, Jowett was appointed regius professor of Greek at Oxford, those who condemned his views at once began to oppose him. He was denounced to the vice-chancellor, who required him to sign the Articles anew in his presence. Jowett's opponents kept up the agitation against him for ten years, preventing him from receiving the full emoluments of his chair till 1865. Meanwhile he had reiterated his objectionable views in a second edition of the *Epistles* (2 vols., 1859) and confirmed the suspicions of his heresy by his essay *On the Interpretation of Scripture,* published in 1860 in the famous *Essays and Reviews.* A prosecution begun against him in the vice-chancellor's court at Oxford, Feb. 20, 1863, was soon dropped (see ESSAYS AND REVIEWS). Henceforth Jowett refrained from publishing anything of a theological nature. Though he preached frequently in the college chapel and in the university pulpit, and preached annually in Westminster Abbey from 1866 till the year of his death, he would not allow any of his sermons to be printed; nor would he permit a third edition of the *Epistles* to be issued during his lifetime (published after his death, condensed by Lewis Campbell, 2 vols., 1894). He was waiting to attain to greater clearness and certainty, hoping that these would come with time; but the exhausting labors which he took upon himself as master of Balliol after 1870, and as vice-chancellor of the university 1882–86, left him no leisure for elaborating his views.

Jowett was an indefatigable worker. For years he made it a rule to see every undergraduate in the college once a week. He spared himself no efforts in tuition. Even as master of Balliol he continued the custom, begun in 1848, of taking a few pupils with him on the summer vacation. After 1866 his authority at Oxford was predominant in matters of university organization. He effected many needed reforms at Oxford, and exerted a large influence over the life and thought of his time. If he formed no school of philosophy or theology, by launching T. H. Green upon the study of Hegel he affected indirectly the whole development of recent speculation in England and America. As early as 1839 he had joined Stanley and Tait in the movement for university reform which led to the Commission of 1850 and the Act of 1854. He also took part in the educational reform which threw open the Indian civil service to competition and was a member of Lord Macaulay's committee, which reported in 1854. He was largely responsible for the University Tests Act of 1871, abolishing the theological test, which had been required for the various degrees, and for college and university offices.

The literary achievement that made Jowett famous was his translation of Plato's *Dialogues* (4 vols., London, 1871; 2d ed., 5 vols., 1875), which has become an English classic, and, with the introductory essay to the several dialogues, secures Jowett a permanent place in the history of English literature. He also translated Thucydides (2 vols., 1881), and Aristotle's *Politics* (2 vols., 1885), and spent many years on an edition of the Greek text of the "Republic" (completed by L. Campbell, 3 vols., Oxford, 1894). Though his work in theology was important, it was rather of a transitional nature. Three volumes of his sermons have been edited by W. H. Fremantle, viz., *College Sermons* (London, 1895), *Sermons, Biographical and Miscellaneous* (1899), and *Sermons on Faith and Doctrine* (1901). Evelyn Abbott and Lewis Campbell have edited his *Letters* (1899), and the latter a volume of *Theological Essays* (1906). The famous essay of *Essays and Reviews*, with the *Dissertations* from *The Epistles of St. Paul* and a sketch of Jowett's life by Sir Leslie Stephen from the National Review, 1897, is reprinted in *The Interpretation of Scripture and Other Essays* (1906) and also in *Scripture and Truth, Dissertations,* ed. Lewis Campbell (1907). Note also *Select Passages from the Theological Writings of B. Jowett,* ed. L. Campbell (1909).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. Abbott and L. Campbell, *Benjamin Jowett: Life and Letters of the Master of Balliol College Oxford*, 3 vols., London, 1897–99; L. A. Tollemache, *Benjamin Jowett, Master of Balliol College*, ib. 1895; *DNB*, Supplement, iii. 49–56.

JOWETT, JOHN HENRY: English Congregationalist; b. at Halifax, Yorkshire, Aug. 25, 1864. He was educated in Hipperholme grammar-school and in the universities of Edinburgh (1883–87) and Oxford (1888–89). His first ministerial charge was as minister of St. James' Congregational Church in Newcastle-on-Tyne, where he was settled from 1889 till 1895, when he was called to succeed Robert William Dale (q.v.) as minister of Carr's Lane Congregational Church in Birmingham, and has ever since ministered to that people. In the summer of 1909 he visited the United States and was a prominent speaker in the Northfield Conference. His publications embrace: *From Strength to Strength* (London, 1898); *Meditations for Quiet Moments* (1899); *Brooks by the Traveller's Way: 26 Week-night Addresses* (1902); *Thirsting for Souls: 26 Week-night Meditations* (1902); *Yet Another Day: a Prayer for Every Day in the Year* (1904); *The Passion for Souls* (1905); *The Epistles of Peter* (1905); *The Silver Lining* (1907); *The High Calling: Meditations on St. Paul's Letter to the Philippians* (1909).

JUAN DE TORQUEMADA See TORQUEMADA, JUAN DE.

JUBILEE, YEAR OF: An institution of the Roman Catholic Church the origin of which is very closely connected with the tendency increasingly prevalent throughout the Middle Ages to make pilgrimages to the tombs of the apostles in Rome. Toward the end of the thirteenth century this tendency was stronger than ever, and the throng of pilgrims was increased by the rumor that on the first day of the new century a plenary indulgence might be obtained, and throughout the remainder of that year one valid for a hundred years. It was found impossible to trace the rumor to any authoritative source; but an aged peasant professed to remember that his father had gone to Rome a hundred years before to win a great indulgence, and had admonished him to look, if he were alive, for the recurrence of the opportunity a century later. Finally, Feb. 22, 1300, by the bull *Antiquorum habet fidem,* Boniface VIII. officially proclaimed a plenary indulgence that might be gained from Christmas throughout the next year, on condition of visits paid during thirty days by Romans, fifteen by strangers, to the basilicas of Saints Peter and Paul. Such indulgences had never previously been granted for more than seven years, and this liberal extension caused immense crowds to throng to Rome. If there had been no other cause for the maintenance of the institution, the large revenues which flowed from it into not only the papal coffers but the pockets of the townspeople would have been a reason to await eagerly the time of its recurrence. In 1342 the Romans sent a deputation to Clement VI. at Avignon to ask him to shorten the interval to fifty years. The request was supported by St. Bridget of Sweden and by Petrarch, and in response to it the pope proclaimed a similar indulgence for 1350. In spite of the Black Death and the obstacles offered by the Hundred Years' War, a greater multitude visited Rome than on the first occasion. The pilgrimage was rendered more desirable by the suspension for the year of all the ordinary indulgences, and easier by the permission given to all conditions of men to make it without obtaining the leave of their immediate superiors; while those who were lawfully hindered from taking the journey might gain the indulgence by proxy. An innovation to be later of great importance was the granting of the indulgence to certain royalties without pilgrimage; the same privilege was conceded to the Augustinians assembled in chapter at Basel, and to the archbishop of Brindisi for thirty persons, these latter paying a sum equivalent to the cost of the visit to Rome. Urban VI. in the bull *Salvator noster* (Apr. 8, 1389) altered the period to thirty-three years, in honor of the earthly life of Christ. The third jubilee was thus held in 1390, and the fourth in 1423 under Martin V., this time with diminished numbers and not without protests such as had been heard at the councils of Pisa and Constance against the impoverishment of the nations by the avarice of the Curia. Nicholas V., returning to the older period, proclaimed the fifth jubilee for 1450.

Through the bull *Ineffabilis* (Apr. 19, 1470), having regard to the shortness of human life, Paul II. established the interval at twenty-five years. The sixth jubilee under Sixtus IV. in 1475 was comparatively poorly attended. The seventh, under Alexander VI. (1500), was more important, and in connection with it the ritual since in the main observed for the opening and closing of the " golden door " in the vestibule of St. Peter's was settled. The eighth, under Clement VII. (1525), was only notable for the sharp criticisms of Luther on the " bull of indiction." The ninth, proclaimed by Paul III. in 1549, shortly before his death, could not be inaugurated until the coronation of his successor Julius III., Feb. 22, 1550. The tenth, under Gregory XIII. (1575), was rendered notable by the lavish hospitality offered to the pilgrims by the Roman sodalities, and by the fact that the influence of the Reformation is seen in there being no mention of money payments. The succeeding jubilees, at regular intervals of twenty-five years from 1600 to 1775, present no special features. The troublous situation did not allow one to be held in 1800, and the nineteenth, proclaimed by Leo XII. in 1825, found few participants from outside of Italy. After a break of seventy-five years, the twentieth was held with all the traditional ceremonies under Leo XIII. in 1900. For the Year of Jubilee among the Hebrews, see SABBATICAL YEAR AND YEAR OF JUBILEE. (T. KOLDE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. C. Lea, *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences*, vol. iii., Philadelphia, 1896; F. Beringer, *Die Ablasse, ihr Wesen und Gebrauch*, Paderborn, 1895; Creighton, *Papacy*, i. 30, 103, 113, 166–167, ii. 115, iv. 79, v. 8–9, vi. 68–75; V. Prinzivalli, *Gli anni santi*, Rome, 1899; A. de Waal, *Das heilige Jahr in Rom*, Frankfort, 1899; J. C. Hedley, *The Holy Year*, London, 1900; H. Thurston, *The Holy Year of Jubilee*, ib. 1900.

JUBILEES, BOOK OF: See PSEUDEPIGRAPHA, OLD TESTAMENT, IV., 33.

JUD, LEO: The most prominent associate of Zwingli and after him of Bullinger; b. at Gemar (30 m. s.w. of Strasburg), Alsace, 1482; d. at Zurich June 19, 1542. He received excellent humanistic instruction at Schlettstadt, and in 1499 entered the University of Basel where he first studied medicine. Influenced by the lectures of Thomas Wyttenbach on the Epistle to the Romans, he devoted himself to theology, together with Zwingli, whose intimate friend he became. In the second decade of the sixteenth century he was preacher at St. Pilt in Alsace. In 1518 he succeeded Zwingli in Einsiedeln, where he worked for the Reformation in the spirit of Zwingli. In 1523 he became pastor of St. Peter's in Zurich. On the occasion of Zwingli's first disputation with the papists, Jud openly expressed his determination to preach the pure Gospel, and in the autumn of 1523 he married a nun. He assisted Zwingli much as Melanchthon did Luther, supporting him in his struggle against the Anabaptists, in the controversy on the Lord's Supper, and in his literary labors by editing his expositions of Scripture and translating his published works into German or Latin. On the death of Zwingli after the battle of Cappel he stood temporarily at the head of the Zurich Church, but the opposition party turned against him as one of the chief instigators of the war. Heinrich Bullinger, the successor of Zwingli, was assisted by him in the same unselfish and successful manner as was Zwingli.

Leo demanded the mutual independence of Church and State. The Church, he maintained, should not be hindered in the execution of its peculiar tasks, especially of discipline, to which, like Calvin, he attached great value. At the same time all compulsion in matters of faith should be abolished. In the efforts for union of the Lutherans and Reformed he defended Zwingli and Oecolampadius against Luther and warned the Strasburg theologians of the " new pope." He took a prominent part in the discussions on the formulation of the first Helvetic Confession, in Aarau and Basel, and his German translation of the Latin original was declared the authentic text. He laid the foundation of the Zurich liturgy by his compilation of a formula of baptism (1523) and other parts of the church service. He possessed extraordinary gifts as a translator and was the leading spirit in the translation of the Zurich Bible, which, beginning in 1538, he compared word by word with the original text, being assisted by Michael Adam, a converted Jew (see BIBLE VERSIONS, B, VII., § 5). Besides this German translation of the Bible Leo rendered great services by his famous and careful Latin translation of the Old Testament which may be considered the principal work of his life. He published also a larger (1534) and a smaller catechism (1534) in German and a Latin catechism (1538). He translated the "Imitation of Christ," Augustine's *De spiritu et littera*, and works of contemporaneous authors. (EMIL EGLI†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A *Vita* was written by his son Johannes, printed in *Miscellanea Tigurina*, Zurich, 1724; the later life is by C. Pestalozzi, Elberfeld, 1860. Consult also: *KL*, vi. 1911–14; J. J. Mezger, *Geschichte der deutschen Uebersetzungen*, pp. 67 sqq., Basel, 1876; S. M. Jackson, *Huldreich Zwingli*, New York, 1903.

JUDAH (Hebr. *Yehudhah;* LXX, *Ioudas*, "praise," originally combined with the name of a deity, later a very common name among the Jews): Fourth son of Jacob and Leah, coming, however, to occupy the place of the first-born; also the leading tribe of the Hebrews, tracing descent from him. His character, in the combined narratives of J and E, while not without its faults, is on the whole noble, energetic and trustworthy, in spite of Gen. xxxviii., which is regarded as Ephraimitic in origin and consequently written with a bias. Later writers incline to the view that the name is not that of an individual but of a clan, and explain the Hirah of xxxviii. 1 as also that of a clan, extending the same notion to the names Er, Onan, Shelah, Pharez, and Zarah. But the narratives suggest rather the traits of an individual from whom the tribe inherited its energy and faithful adherence to law. Jacob's blessing (Gen. xlix. 8–12) transfers the birthright of Reuben to Judah, passing over Simeon and Levi, and describes the lion-hearted tribe of the future in its land of wine and milk. In Egypt the tribe became the largest in numbers, including three principal clans and two lesser clans (Num. xxvi. 20–21; cf. I Chron. iv. 1), while in Caleb (q.v.) there is seen a non-Israelitic tribe which coalesced with Judah. The genealogy in I Chron. ii. 3 sqq., is given with especial reference to the descent of David through Nahshon (verse 10, cf. Num. i. 7). The two censuses in the wandering give respectively 74,600 and 76,500 men (Num. i. 27, xxvi. 22), and the arrangement of the camp gives the primacy to Judah (Num. ii. 3), which the energetic Caleb led (Num. xiii. 6). After Joshua's death, the tribe took the leadership in the conflict with the Canaanites (Judges i., cf. xx. 18), though confining its operations to its own territory and that of Simeon, in the south.

The tribal possessions, described in Josh. xv. 1–12, were divided into four parts: the mountains of Judah, the eastern declivity down to the Dead Sea, the southern slope toward Edom, and the plain toward the Mediterranean, which last, however, remained in the hand of the Philistines (see JUDEA). During the period of the Judges, the tribe took little part in the conflicts of its northern neighbors (Judges iii. 9, xii. 8, cf. x. 9, xv. 9 sqq.). It had no share in the campaign against Sisera or in Gideon's struggle with Midian; in the former case because it was politically isolated from the Joseph tribes, though not to the extent asserted by Stade. Even in Saul's time it was not prominent in the army (I Sam. xi. 8, xv. 4), but with the accession of David its eminence began (II Sam. ii. 4). The capture of Jerusalem gave it increased prestige through its possession of a center of strength. Its fidelity was constant, and even in the return the greater number of the returning exiles belonged to this tribe. Its greatest honor, however, consisted in its giving to the world the Messiah who, as the "lion of the tribe of Juda" (Rev. v. 5), overcame the world and established an eternal kingdom.

For the history of the kingdom of Judah, see ISRAEL, HISTORY OF. (C. VON ORELLI.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: In addition to the literature given under AHAB; ISRAEL, HISTORY OF; and JUDEA, consult: L. B. Paton, *Early History of Syria and Palestine*, New York, 1901; G. A. Barton, *Semitic Origins*, pp. 271–286, ib. 1902; *DB*, ii. 792–794; *EB*, ii. 2617–2623; *JE*, vii. 326–330.

JUDAS, jū'das: One of the twelve Apostles. The name occurs in the New Testament only in the lists of the Apostles, yet, including the matter of the reading of the text, it raises several knotty problems. This Judas is to be distinguished from Judas Iscariot on the basis of John xiv. 22; and from Jude (Judas, Juda), the brother of our Lord (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3), on the basis of Luke vi. 16 and Acts i. 13 ("*the brother* [better, *the son*] of James"). The chief difficulty is raised by the fact that in two of the lists of Apostles the name of this Judas is omitted and apparently in its place is found either "Lebbeus, whose surname was Thaddeus" (Matt. x. 3 A. V., a conflate reading, cf. R. V., which, following the leading textual critics, omits "Lebbeus, whose surname was"), or "Thaddeus" (Mark iii. 18). Accordingly most scholars accept the identification of this Judas with Lebbeus and Thaddeus, though some have supposed that James had died and that his place was taken by Lebbeus-Thaddeus. Of the career of Judas nothing is known except that he asked the question recorded in John xiv. 22. Yet a considerable mass of legend grew up (cf. *Acta Thaddaei;* see APOCRYPHA, B, II., 12) in connection with his mission (as Thaddeus) to Abgar (q.v.), in which confusion is apparent as to his relation to Jesus or perhaps as to his identity. Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, I., xii., *NPNF*, 1 ser., i. 99) makes him one of the Seventy (not of the Twelve), while Jerome (on Matt. x. 4, *MPL*, xxvi. 61) calls him an apostle. The later accounts professing to tell the story of his life and work have no historical value.

GEO. W. GILMORE.

JUDAS: A chronographer mentioned by Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, vi. 7, *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 254). In this passage Eusebius speaks of a certain Judas, otherwise unknown, who, in a tract on the "Seventy Weeks of Daniel," put forth some chronological reckonings on the basis of Daniel's prophecies, coming down to the tenth year of Septimius Severus (202), and predicting the speedy return of the Lord. Closer identification of the author is impossible.

G. KRÜGER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Schlatter, in *TU*, xii. 1 (1894); K. Erbes, in *TLZ*, 1895, pp. 415–418.

JUDAS OF GALILEE: The leader of a Jewish insurrection against the Romans, mentioned in Acts v. 37. According to Josephus (*Ant.*, XVIII., i 6; *War*, II., viii. 1; cf. *Ant.*, XX., v. 2; *War*, II., xvii. 8), when the taxing of the Jewish people in the governorship of Quirinius (q.v.) under Augustus aroused strong opposition, a certain Judas, born in Gamala but generally called "the Galilean," with the help of a Pharisee named Zadok, organized an insurrection which was based on religious motives. The taxation emphasized the loss of Jewish independence under Roman rule and of their theocracy. The two sources (Gamaliel in Acts, and Josephus) agree in viewing the insurrection from a religious standpoint, though differences of another sort appear. Gamaliel reports the destruction of Judas and of his following, of which Josephus says nothing. The latter connects the outbreak with the fermenting zealotism manifested later, in the outbreak under Gessius Florus, and he is corroborated in this by the prominent part taken by the sons of Judas in that outbreak. Of this nothing is manifest in the speech of Gamaliel. The chronological datum is the relation of the insurrection to the taxing, put by Zahn in 4–3 B.C. (*Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, iv. 1893, 633–654, and *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, ii., Leipsic, 1900, 395 sqq.). The differences in the two accounts prove that the author of Acts was here independent of Josephus and drew from other sources.

(K. Schmidt.)

Bibliography: *DB*, ii. 795–796; *EB*, ii. 2628–30; *JE*, vii. 370–371; Schürer, *Geschichte*, i. 420–421, et passim, Eng. transl., I., ii. 4, et passim.

JUDAS ISCARIOT, is-car′i-ət: One of the twelve disciples, and the betrayer of Jesus. The references to Judas in the New Testament are: (1) Mention in the list of the disciples, Matt. x. 4; Mark iii. 19; Luke vi. 16. (2) Occasional allusions, John vi. 70, 71, xii. 4, xvii. 12. (3) History of the betrayal, Matt. xxvi. 14–16, 21–25, 46–50; Mark xiv. 10, 11, 18–21, 42–46; Luke xxii. 3–6, 21–23, 47–48; John xiii. 2–11, 18, 21–30, xviii. 2–9. (4) Account of his death, Matt. xxvii. 3–10; Acts i. 16–25. Only John writes the full name, "Judas Iscariot the son of Simon." The ordinary surname is Iscariot (Hebr. *Ishḳeriyyoth*), "Man of [the village] Keriyyoth" (Kerioth, Josh. xv. 25), a place in northern Judea, the modern al-Karyatain, south of Hebron.

The synoptic tradition is limited to a few chief details. It gives nothing from the earlier life of Judas, but begins about the time when the authorities in Jerusalem had determined to kill Jesus, and Judas engaged to betray him into their hands. Matthew and Luke do not imply that the betrayal was induced by anything more than the money offered or that opposition to Jesus was Judas' motive; indeed Judas appears as the instrument of higher powers—notice the words of Luke, "Satan entered into Judas." The event was not unexpected to Jesus, since at the Last Supper he announced his coming betrayal by one of the twelve. While to the twelve this event seemed at the time most improbable, to Jesus it was not so and indeed was in keeping, in his view, with the divine purpose as expressed in the Scriptures and was a necessary means for the accomplishment of the divine plan. Consequently results followed not without the assistance of Jesus himself. While the leaders out of fear of a popular uprising would have let the feast go by, immediately after the Last Supper, at which Jesus had predicted the betrayal, Judas appeared at the head of a force furnished by the authorities. As Judas' question at the supper had been answered with a categorical "yes," it appeared that Judas was fearful that his purpose was fully known to Jesus and might be thwarted; the action of Judas was therefore hastened, while Jesus went to the place where he would be expected to go (Luke: "as his custom was"). It was then by the cooperation of Jesus that he was delivered to his enemies. The mildness with which Jesus received the betraying kiss suggests that the method of betrayal proceeded not from shameless effrontery, but from fear of an outbreak from Judas' codisciples. Even here Judas appears not as a consummate villain but as one who in consequence of an unhappy frailty was constrained to accomplish a revolting deed.

Compared with the synoptic narrative, the Johannine report seems to have been intended to supplement and add coloring; thus John does not report how Judas came to put himself at the disposal of the enemies of Jesus, but in the account of the anointing of Jesus (x. 1 sqq.) remarks that Judas was a thief. John (xiii. 27) and Luke (xxii. 3) both testify to the entrance of Satan into Judas, but John (xiii. 2) teaches that the way had been prepared though the height of evil conception had not been reached till the supper, that Judas was already predisposed to evil before the actual reception of the Satanic influence. John notes also that when, at the betrayal, Jesus met the force sent against him, Judas stood with that force and was affected as they were at the words of Jesus. John brings out into strong relief the thought that Jesus foreknew the treachery of Judas, that indeed in the choice of Judas as a disciple the fulfilment of Scripture by this means had been in mind, that the loss of this one from those whom the Father had given Jesus was also a matter of fulfilment of prophecy (xvii. 12), and that all this was but the carrying out of the will of God. Similarly John emphasizes the self-surrender of Jesus in his cooperation with the plans of Judas.

The Gospel of Matthew in its interest in Messianic prediction carries the history of Judas further, but fully in accord with the supposition that Judas was not animated with hostility to Jesus, so that he attempted to return the price of the betrayal, and when it was not received, threw it on the ground and went away and hanged himself. This relation is to be brought into connection with the narrative in II Sam. xvii. and with another Old-Testament passage regarded as Messianic. A variant account of the end of Judas is given in Acts i. 18–19, which furnishes one of the problems of New-Testament criticism to be solved by recalling that the central point in the speech of Peter was that a vacancy had occurred in the apostolic college which was to be filled. The essential difference in the two accounts is that in one case the purchase of the field is attributed to Judas, in the other case to the authorities. The narration by Papias of the story of the end of Judas (cf. Zahn in *TSK*, 1866, pp. 680–689) had as its purpose the reconciliation of the two accounts.

(K. Schmidt.)

Bibliography: Excellent critical discussions are found in *DB*, ii. 796 sqq.; *EB*, ii. 2623–2628. The older literature is given in G. B. Winer, *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, i. 635, Leipsic, 1847–48. Consult further: Abraham a Sancta Clara, *Judas der Erzschelm*, in his *Werke*, Passau, 1835–1837; Zandt, *Commentatio de Juda proditore*, Leipsic, 1769; E. Daub, *Judas Ischariot*, Heidelberg, 1816–18; *JE*, vii. 371; and the literature on the life and passion of Jesus and commentaries on the Gospels and Acts.

JUDAS MACCABEUS. See Hasmoneans.

JUDE, EPISTLE OF: One of the seven General Epistles. The title ascribes it to Jude the brother of James, and nowhere does the epistle claim to be by an apostle; on the contrary, verse 17 gives the impression that the author was not of the Twelve. The James who is mentioned can hardly be any other than James the brother of the Lord, one of the three pillars of the Jewish-Christian Church, while the Jude must be the Judas (Juda) of Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3, a son of Mary and therefore not an apostle. It is noticeable that neither Jude nor his brother James in their epistles claims other than a spiritual relationship to Christ ("servant of Jesus Christ"—and in a subordinate sense solely the mark of a becoming modesty). Between the epistles of James and of Jude there are many points of contact. The titles are so similar that the first verse of Jude seems a reminiscence of Jas. i. 1; both lack personal greetings and neither is directed to a local community, but rather each is meant for a wide circle of the Church and has the character of an encyclical, though of the two the epistle of Jude seems to have the larger scope, not being directed to "the twelve tribes" (Jas. i. 1). With this large circle of readers ("them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ") everything in the epistle agrees. The matters discussed are those in which the whole Church has interest; while the occasion might be local, the theme is general—salvation (verse 3). The epistle, like that of James, is directed against a form of worldliness which might arise either from Jewish or heathen surroundings, and may have in mind a developed form of antinomianism. Jude has also in mind actual moral depravity against which he gives warning. The persons addressed live in carnal impurity, perhaps in unnatural sin, are sensual, behave unseemly at the love feasts, and are guided by their own lusts (verses 8, 10, 12, 16). While these are practical irregularities of life, false teaching is in view, and the hearers are exhorted to hold the faith (verses 3–4), against those who turn grace into lasciviousness and deny God and Jesus Christ. The evils are also of a speculative nature ("dreamers," verse 8), out of which ethical evils arise. The teaching here guarded against is neither the Gnosticism of the second century nor Carpocratianism, though a sort of dualism is evidently put forward (verse 19), but evidently of the same sort as that in Paul's mind in the distinction between spiritual and carnal expressed in I Cor. ii. 14–15. It is to be noted that the errors against which the writer speaks appear in the communities; they do not constitute a separate movement. They may be regarded as the incipient stages of what became types of Gnosticism. The reports of Hegesippus of error which arose in the Christian communities of Palestine, the heresy of the Epistle to the Colossians, of the pastoral letters, and the teaching of Cerinthus, having a tinge of libertinism with its spiritualistic-dualistic Jewish Christianity, all suggest a relationship with the errant teaching against which Jude speaks. While, then, error of a Jewish origin is suggested, there is also a reminder of a characteristically heathen form of sin as shown in the Corinthian libertinism denounced by Paul. And, once more, the error of the Nicolaitans (q.v.) is recalled by the deeds of the people against whom Jude gives warning. Such manifestations were a danger to the whole Church, and the epistle directs itself to this peril.

After the greeting (1–2) and the preface (3–4), follows the argument, which condemns teachers of error (5–19); three examples of gross sin are cited from history and the punishment recalled (5–7), the similarity of these historic cases with the present error is asserted (8), an example of moderation is given (9), and with it a description of the errant course (10–13); punishment was predicted as long ago as Enoch's period and later by the Apostles (14–19). An exhortation follows and then a magnificent doxology (20–25). For the date of the epistle the employment of the Assumption of Moses (44 A.D.) and acquaintance with the Epistle to the Romans (cf. 24–25 with Rom. xvi. 25–27) set the higher limit. The *terminus ad quem* is not so easily fixed, but the time just prior to Domitian is the latest date to which it can be postponed, since according to Hegesippus Jude was not alive during Domitian's reign (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, III., xx.). This assumes the genuineness of the letter, which is not strongly attested. The Muratorian Canon names the epistle, but not as written by Jude; Origen knows that it has been questioned; the early Peschito did not receive it and Eusebius reckons it among the *Antilegomena;* Jerome notes that it was rejected by most on account of its citation of apocryphal books. Yet it is difficult to account for an ungenuine letter being put forth in the name of a man whose repute was so small as that of Jude, the brother of our Lord, and it is noteworthy that the writer makes no pretension of being an apostle.

(F. Sieffert.)

Bibliography: Possibly the best commentaries are by J. B. Mayor (with II Peter), London, 1907; and H. von Soden, Göttingen, 1899. Others are by: W. Jenkyn (1612–85), ed. J. Sherman, London, 1839; R. Stier, Berlin, 1850; M. F. Rampf, Sulzbach, 1854; F. Gardiner, Boston, 1856; J. T. Demarest (on the Catholic Epistles), New York, 1879; E. H. Plumptre (on Peter and Jude), in *Cambridge Bible*, Cambridge, 1879; K. F. Keil (Peter and Jude), Leipsic, 1883; F. Spitta (on Peter and Jude), Halle, 1885; A. F. Manoury (on the Catholic Epistles), Bar-le-Duc, 1888; A. Plummer, in *Expositor's Bible*, London, 1891; C. Bigg (on Peter and Jude), Edinburgh, 1901.

Questions of introduction are treated in the works on Biblical Introduction (q.v.) and on N. T. theology (e.g., W. Beyschlag, Edinburgh, 1896). Consult further: F. Maier, *Der Judasbrief, seine Echtheit, Abfassungszeit und Leser*, Freiburg, 1906; E. Arnaud, *Recherches critiques sur l'epître de Jude*, Strasburg, 1851; P. J. Gloag, *Introduction to the Catholic Epistles*, Edinburgh, 1887; A. C. McGiffert, *Hist. of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, pp. 585–588, New York, 1897; Harnack, *Litteratur*, ii. 1, pp. 465–469; *DB*, ii. 799–806 (minute and searching); *EB*, ii. 2630–32.

JUDEA, jʊ-dî'ɑ.

I. The Name and the Territory.
  History (§ 1).
  Boundaries of Judea Proper (§ 2).
II. Detailed Description.
1. The Territory of Judah.
  Limits, Population and Divisions (§ 1).
  The Shephelah (§ 2).
  The Hill Country (§ 3).
  Hebron (§ 4).
  Mamre (§ 5).
  Other Cities of Josh. xv. (§ 6).
  Places Named in Later Records (§ 7).
2. The Territory of Benjamin.
  General Description; Jericho (§ 1).
  The First Group of Benjamite Cities (§2).
  The Second Group (§ 3).
  Other Places of Note (§ 4).
3. The Judean Territory of Dan.
4. The Judean Territory of Ephraim.
5. Cities on the Western Plain.
6. The Eleven Toparchies of Judea According to Josephus.

1. History.

I. The Name and the Territory: Judea is the term applied from about 300 B.C. by Greeks and Romans to the land inhabited by the Jews. The limits of the country are to be gathered from passages in Nehemiah (iii. and vii.) and in I and II Maccabees. These reports, while not entirely accordant, yet supplement each other, and start from the point of view either of governmental rule, of tribal possession, or of relationship to the religious community. The boundaries are fairly well indicated in Neh. iii.; on the south Bethzur marked the border, in the north Bethhoron, and on the west Emmaus, and these are approximately the limits implied in the Books of Maccabees (cf. the list of fortresses "in Judea" in I Macc. ix. 50 sqq.). Under the Persians, as under the Greeks, this region shared the fate of southern Syria. After the death of Alexander the Great it fell into the hand of the Ptolemies (q.v.), who held control of it almost continuously till 198 B.C. It was a part of the province of "Celesyria" (I Macc. x. 69) or of "Celesyria and Phenice" (II Macc. iii. 5). The inhabitants, on account of their religion, were granted many privileges until the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, but the payment of tribute was enforced, if necessary, by the presence of garrisons, a situation which the Maccabean revolution brought to an end (I Macc. x. 25–45). The Greek name for this territory, *Ioudaia*, as well as the adjective *Ioudaios*, is not to be derived from the Hebrew *Yehudhi* but from the Aramaic *Yehudhay* (Ezra iv. 12; Dan. iii. 8). The earliest sure traces of the use of this name are found at the end of the fourth century B.C., contemporaneously with the beginning of Greek control of the Orient. In I Maccabees the usage is divided between the normal Greek form and a Hebraizing form *Iouda*, with a preference for the latter. As a result of the Hasmonean uprising (see HASMONEANS) the territory was enlarged and the name had both a narrow and a wider content. The extension of territory was begun by Jonathan, when in 147 B.C. Alexander Balas gave to him the city of Ekron with its surrounding territory. In 145 B.C. Demetrius II. added three districts in the north and west which had belonged to Samaria (I Macc. xi. 28, 34, 57), named "Apherema, Lydda, and Ramathem" after the names of their chief cities. Apherema is probably the *Ephraeim* or *Efraea* of the *Onomasticon* (ccliv. 118, cclvii. 121), about twenty Roman miles north of Jerusalem; Lydda corresponds to the Lod of the Old Testament (Ezra ii. 33); and Ramathem was about nine miles northeast of Lydda and six west of Thamna. The probable reason for this grant was that the population was largely Jewish. Soon after, Bethzur was taken away from the Seleucidæ (I Macc. xi. 66), and in 142 B.C. Joppa was taken and then Judaized (I Macc. xii. 33), and the same happened to Gezer (I Macc. xiii. 43 sqq.). John Hyrcanus took Medaba and Samega across the Jordan, also Samaria and Scythopolis, and in the south the territory of the Idumeans. Aristobulus conquered from the Itureans a part of their territory. Alexander Jannæus annexed considerable territory across the Jordan and Raphia, Anthedon, and Gaza on the Mediterranean. In 63 B.C. Pompey restricted Judea to strictly Jewish territory. Herod came into possession of Samaria, Batanea, Auranitis, Trachonitis, and the region of the Jordan sources. During the first century of the Christian era the changes in apportionment of the territory were numerous. In the second century Judea came to be called *Syria Palestina*, and after the fourth century simply *Palestina*. Josephus distinguishes Judea from Samaria, makes Judea stand for the region under Hyrcanus or Herod, or for the district ruled by procurators after 6 A.D., or for the region granted to Vespasian. When he extends the use of the word, he uses the phrase "all Judea," equivalent to the "Canaan" of the Old Testament.

2. Boundaries of Judea Proper.

Judea as treated in this article is the smaller region as distinguished from Samaria, Galilee, and Perea, defined partly in Josephus and in the Talmud. Josephus (*Ant.* XIV., iii. 4) makes Koreæ, the modern Karawa, the most northern city, and includes the regions of Thamna, Gophna, and Akrabattine (that is, the *Akrabbein* of the *Onomasticon* ccxiv.), while Josephus draws the line of the northern boundary through *Anuath Borkaios*, possibly the *'Othnay* of the Talmud. The Talmud also locates Antipatris as a boundary city, possibly the modern Kalat Ras al-Aïn northwest of Jaffa and north of Lydda. Whether Judea at the beginning of the Christian era included a part of the coast is doubtful. Joppa had been in the possession of the Jews and Jamnia had a large Jewish population, but the way in which Josephus mentions these places (*War*, III., iii. 5) implies that they were not regarded as strictly Judean. The fact that the seat of Roman government was at Cæsarea does not involve that any portion of the seacoast was properly within the territory of Judea. The western boundary was not stable, varying in different periods. Only at times was any part of the Philistine territory under the Jews, as when Gaza or Ekron or Ashdod was under Jonathan or Herod. On the south, Judea was bounded by the toparchies of Idumea and Engedi, but the exact limits fluctuated. The eastern boundary was the Dead Sea and the Jordan.

II. Detailed Description.—1. The Territory of Judah: According to the Old Testament this re-

1. Limits, Population, and Divisions.

gion was inhabited by the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, Dan, and a part of Ephraim. In spite of the exact details given in Josh. xv. 1–12, the limits assigned to the tribe of Judah can not be determined for lack of identification of many places named in the passage. It is probable also that the boundary there given was not one which remained constant as separating the tribes, and the limits assigned to the tribe and those of the kingdom of Judah may not be taken as equivalents. Still further, it must be remembered that in Joshua the limits are rather ideal than actual, as when the Mediterranean is given as the western boundary, a condition which was realized only in small part and not till the time of Alexander Jannæus and of Herod the Great, though the Philistines were at times tributary. The northeast corner, according to the passage, was where the Jordan enters the Dead Sea, and the boundary passed by Beth-hoglah (Kasr Hajla) to Adummim (Talat al-Damm), then by En-rogel through the Hinnom valley on the west down to Kirjath-jearim, and thence westward to the seacoast. In this Old-Testament territory of Judah dwelt others than the members of the tribe, the chief city of which was Bethlehem. The three great families of the tribe, Shelah, Perez, and Zerah (Gen. xlvi. 12) are in part connected with the Canaanitic Shua and partly with Tamar (Gen. xxxviii.), which is perhaps identical with the city (or region) of Tamar on the border of the Negeb, inhabited by Kenizzite or Jerahmeelite affiliations—the stock which furnished new life to the waning tribe of Judah. A part of the Danites which remained in the south became incorporated into the tribe of Judah (Josh. xv. 33, xix. 41). Farther south dwelt the numerous families of the Calebites and Kenizzites in the region of Hebron, and still to the south the Kenites and Jerahmeelites. While the Calebites appear in early times to have been a dominant family, this dominance was lost under David and the whole territory received its name from the principal element of the population at that time, though still later the Calebites came to the front again, until in the Exile the inroads of the Edomites pressed them northward and compelled them to seek homes in the neighborhood of the depopulated Jerusalem, where they became fully identified with the Judaic element. From the Edomitic intruders into the southern region that part received the new name of Idumea, and in Maccabean times Bethzur was on the boundary between the two regions.

2. The Shephelah.

The passage in Joshua divides the whole region into four parts: the Negeb (q.v.), the Shephelah, the hill country, and the desert (see Palestine). According to the original text of Josh. xv., the Shephelah had three groups of cities, according to the extended text, four groups, and a distinction is made between towns (protected by a wall), forty-four in number, and villages. The first group (Josh. xv. 33–36) includes fifteen towns, of which the following are known: Eshtaol, identified by Guérin with Ashu'a on the basis of its earlier name Ashtu'al; Zorah, possibly the Ẓarḥa of the Amarna Tablets; Zanoah, the modern Zanu'a; Adullam, identified by Clermont-Ganneau with Khirbat 'Id al-Miya; Socoh is Shuwaika, on the south bank of the Wadi al-Sant. The second group, of sixteen towns, is located to the west and southwest of the first, toward Gaza (verses 37–41). Mizpeh is placed at the foot of the hills near the Wadi al-Sant, westward from Shuwaika. Lachish is identified with Tell el-Hesy, recently excavated, mentioned in the Amarna Tablets as an important Canaanitic center, and appearing in the Assyrian records and in the Books of Kings. Eglon is the modern Ajlan, and Lahmas or Lahmam is the modern Lahm. The third group (verses 42–44) of nine (Septuagint, ten) cities includes Libnah (known to Eusebius as Lobna in the neighborhood of Eleutheropolis); Keilah, located by the *Onomasticon* seven Roman miles east of Eleutheropolis on the Wadi al-Sur (but this is in the highland, not in the Shephelah); Achzib, placed by the same authority near Eleutheropolis and possibly the modern Ain el-Kazba; and Maresha, located two Roman miles from Eleutheropolis, possibly at Merash. On the fourth group, including Ekron, Ashdod, and Gaza, see Philistines.

3. The Hill Country.

The towns of the hill country of Judah are in the Hebrew text (verses 48–60) divided into five groups, to which the Septuagint adds a sixth. The first group of eleven cities lay south from Hebron, southeast of Jibrin. Shamir is placed by Guérin at Somara southwest of Hebron. The *Onomasticon* locates Jattir twenty Roman miles from Eleutheropolis, the modern Attir; Socoh is Shuwaika north of Attir; Debir (Kirjath-sannah or Kirjath-sepher) was a royal Canaanitic city of some importance, possibly the modern al-Dahariya; Anab is the present Anab, about three miles southwest of Debir; Eshtemoah may be al-Samua east of Shuwaika; Anim is put by the *Onomasticon* nine Roman miles south of Hebron. The second group of nine cities lay north of the first group and includes Hebron (verses 52–54). Arab appears in the Septuagint as Airem, but its location is doubtful; Dumah is represented by the modern al-Doma north of al-Dahariya, and is placed by Eusebius and Jerome seventeen Roman miles from Eleutheropolis; Beth-tappuah is the elevated village Taffuh, six miles west of Hebron in a wine-growing country. It was in early times a fortress and was fortified in the Maccabean war (I Macc. ix. 50). The *Onomasticon* makes it a boundary city between Palestine and Egypt.

4. Hebron.

Hebron was regarded as of considerable antiquity, built seven years earlier than Zoan (Tanis) in Egypt (Num. xiii. 22), and with this corresponds the notable part Hebron takes in the narratives concerning the patriarchs. It appears as a city of the Anakites, who were of the race of the giants (Num. xiii. 33), and its old name was Kirjath-arba, "fourfold city," explained in Jewish legend as the place of settlement of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Adam or Caleb. P in several passages locates the Hittites there. The Idumean inhabitants of the time of Josephus said that the city was older than Memphis in Egypt. The concurrence of tradition makes it possible that Hebron was the oldest of the southern cities of Judah. Its situation in a defensible location and in a comparatively fruitful region makes the tradition of its age still more probable, and to this is added that its site was on the principal roads which traverse the region, making it a center of commerce also. Hommel would connect the name Hebron with the *Ḥabiri* of the Amarna Tablets (q.v.) as originally *Ḥabiran,* i.e., town of the Habiri. According to Josh. x. 36 it was conquered by Joshua when at the head of all the people after the campaign against the five kings, but Judges i. 10 ascribes its conquest to the tribe of Judah alone. It was the home of the Calebites, and the narrative in Josh. xv. 13–19 attributes to Joshua the gift of the region to them. The later history of Hebron is little known. It became the home of David and his company, where he was sought by the Judahites, and was his capital until the capture of Jerusalem, after which it lost its importance. The rebellion of Absalom began there, Rehoboam fortified it, in the time of the exile the Edomites reduced it and held possession of it till Judas Maccabeus took it in 164 B.C. The priest code made it one of the cities of refuge and the Chronicler regards it as Jewish at the time of Zerubbabel. The place on the site now identified as that of Hebron is called al-Halil or Halil al-Rahman, " Friend of the Merciful," in memory of Abraham, whose tomb is still pointed out in the neighborhood. According to Gen. xxiii. 9 sqq., the tomb was in a cave in Machpelah " before Mamre," and Mamre is identified with Hebron in Gen. xxiii. 19; consequently the cave was to the east of the city. But this does not correspond with the present situation, since the greater part of the city is to the east of the tomb. But there are clear evidences that a hill to the west of the present city was in early times thickly populated, and that would correspond with the old Mamre. The tomb is said to have received the bodies of Sarah, Abraham, Isaac, Rebecca, Leah and Jacob. Josephus speaks of a monument of the Abrahamic family in Hebron, of marble and beautifully worked, while the tomb was hewn out of the rock—a description which agrees well with the Genesis account of the cave. The Pilgrim of Bordeaux (c. 333 A.D.) mentions a monument there, Antoninus Martyr (570 A.D.) notes a basilica with a court in the middle, which in the seventh century passed into the possession of the Mohammedans, the haram of the present city, the lower walls of which are old and built of large stones. The entrance is on the east, and between the inner and outer walls are two octagonal chapels in which stand the cenotaphs of Abraham and Sarah. The mosque itself measures some ninety feet by sixty-eight, and is divided into three aisles with nine vaults, the middle one containing the monument of Isaac and Rebecca. The cave in which were the graves of the patriarchs is asserted to be under the mosque, and it is regarded as double in form and has two entrances. The northern part of the haram area contains a number of modern grave monuments, and one of them contains the cenotaph of Jacob and Leah. What is called the tomb of Joseph is in an addition built against the encircling wall at some time later than the crusades. The description of the interior is gathered from the observations of notables to whom the privilege of entrance has in recent years been granted through the special favor of the sultan, since admission to " unbelievers " is refused by the fanatical Moslems of Hebron. This favor was granted to the Prince of Wales (1862), the Marquis of Bute (1866), the Crown Prince of Prussia (1869), and Prince Albert Victor and Prince George of Wales (1882). The report based on examination next preceding that of these later observations was made by monks of the Latin Church in 1119 A.D., and stated that there were chambers under the mosque. The oldest part of the entire structure is the splendid encircling wall, and De Vogüé remarks upon the resemblance of the stones which compose it to those of the south wall of the haram in Jerusalem, rightly attributed to Herod the Great; the Pilgrim of Bordeaux knew such a wall, though Josephus says nothing about it. Some of the capitals of the columns have a Byzantine character and the inclusion of old parts in what is evidently more modern agrees with the statement of Samuel bar Simson (c. 1210 A.D.) to the effect that the sanctuary at Hebron was built 600 years before his time. The present Hebron, divided into seven quarters, has a population of some 19,000, of whom 1,500 are Jews having three synagogues, and the rest Moslems who display a specially fanatical spirit against all foreigners. The immediate region is fruitful, and some industries and considerable commerce are conducted there.

5. Mamre.

In connection with the Mamre of Abraham are mentioned oaks or terebinths where the patriarch built an altar (Gen. xiii. 18); if Mamre is a location opposite the tombs of the patriarchs (Gen. xxiii. 19, xxxv. 27), there is a connection with a holy place. Gen. xiv. 13 speaks of Mamre as a man, an Amorite and brother of Eshcol and Aner. Eshcol is mentioned as a place (Num. xiii. 23 and elsewhere), possibly the modern Iskahal six miles northwest of Hebron. This representation in Gen. xiv. is now regarded as that of a later and special source, and is taken as less reliable than those which make these names apply to places and not individuals, especially as Aner is identified with the hill Na'ir in West Hebron and Mamre with Nimra in the northern part of the city. Yet it must be said that these identifications are uncertain and do not fit the data of the Old Testament. The Septuagint of Gen. xiii. 18 uses the singular in speaking of the oak, and this agrees with Josephus, *Ant.* I., x. 4, though the latter suggests the weaving of a myth about the place, and in Josephus, *War*, IV., ix. 7, mention is made of a large terebinth as old as the world situated six stadia from Hebron. Echoes of this sacred tree with its sanctuary come from the times of Hadrian and of Constantine; possibly the tree was destroyed under the latter emperor, as Jerome says that it was in existence while he was still a youth. A place which corresponds well is mentioned in itineraries, and this agrees with the present Ramat al-Halil (" Ramah of Abraham ") two miles north of Hebron east of the road to Jerusalem, where ruins suggest an old sanctuary. Farther to the east are the remains of a large church, possibly those of the basilica built by Constantine. Traces of recollection of the tree in this locality were found as late as 1856. Since the thirteenth century there have been traces of a tradition of an Abraham's oak to the south, on a site possessed by the Russians. The differences in the traditions and locations assigned may be due to the fact that a grove or groves existed in the earlier times, which dwindled to a single tree perhaps as early as the time of the Septuagint.

6. Other Cities of Josh. xv.

The third group of cities of the hill country includes ten cities (Septuagint, nine), located east of the second and north of the first group. Maon, the modern Ma'in, appears as the home of the Calebite Nabal (I Sam. xxv. 2), and on the site are remains of walls, caves, and cisterns. The "wilderness of Maon" (I Sam. xxiii. 24) was probably the region to the southeast. Carmel, a possession of Nabal, is the modern al-Karmal, about seven miles south of Hebron. Ziph (I Chron. ii. 42; I Sam. xxiii. 19) corresponds with the present Tell Zif southeast of Hebron, while Josh. xv. 24 refers to another place in the Negeb. Juttah (Josh. xxi. 16) retains its name and lies south of Hebron, a large village whose inhabitants possess great herds of sheep. Jezreel is treated in a special article. Of the Gibea of this region no traces remain, though the *Onomasticon* names it. The fourth group (Josh. xv. 58–59) includes six cities situated north of Hebron. Halhul retains its old name, an important village five and a half miles distant from Hebron. Beth-zur is regarded (I Chron. ii. 45) as Calebite, and in Neh. iii. 16 as a double district. It was an important fortress in the Maccabean wars, lying a little west of the road to Jerusalem, near a good spring where ruins attest the situation. Gedor, the modern Jedur, north of Beth-zur, is mentioned in I Chron. xii. 7 and after the exile was inhabited by Calebites. Beth-anoth (probably meaning "sanctuary of the goddess Anath") is possibly the modern Bat Ainun, southeast of Halhul, where ruins still exist. The other places are unidentified. The fifth group is known only through the text of the Septuagint, and includes eleven places of which eight can be placed. Tekoa appears in Amos i. 1; II Sam. xiv. 2 sqq., xxiii. 26, and was often mentioned in the regal and post-exilic periods. The present Tekua, nearly ten miles south of Jerusalem, contains ruins of a Christian church and cisterns and tombs. Ephrathah is in the Greek text equated with Bethlehem (cf. Gen. xxxv. 19), though there is doubt whether Ephrathah was not the name of a district. Peor, in the neighborhood of Bethlehem, corresponds with the present Faghur. Etam appears in I Chron. iv. 3 and II Chron. xi. 6, and corresponds with the modern 'Ain Atan. Kulon may be the present Kaluniyeh, northwest of Jerusalem, on the road to Jaffa. Sores may be the present Saris, west of Jerusalem, south of the same road. Karem is possibly 'Ain Karim, four and a half miles west of Jerusalem. Bether is regarded as the true name for the Gibeon of Neh. vii. 25, the modern Bittir, six miles southwest of Jerusalem. The sixth group (Josh. xv. 60) includes only two cities, Kirjath-baal (Kirjath-jearim) and Rabbah, clearly west of Jerusalem. The name of the first varies in different passages. It was one of the cities of the Gibeonites, the ark remained there a long time, it was the home of the prophet Uriah, and after the exile was reckoned among the possessions of the Jewish community. While its direction from various places is in different passages given with apparent exactness upon the boundary between Judah and Benjamin, and according to the *Onomasticon* some nine or ten Roman miles from Jerusalem along the old road to Diospolis (Lydda), the exact location is still disputed. The last portion of the Judaic territory (Josh. xv. 61–62) takes in "the wilderness," i.e., the eastern slope of the hills toward the Dead Sea. The Hebrew text mentions six cities, the Septuagint seven with very different names. Two of these are identified. The City of Salt lay probably in the Valley of Salt (II Sam. viii. 13), therefore to the south corresponding to Tell al-Milh, about fifteen miles east of Beersheba. En-gedi lay on the Dead Sea (Ezek. xlvii. 10), and, according to the *Onomasticon*, was a large village. The name corresponds with that of the present Ain Jidi on a terrace above the sea, near which are the remains of an old wall. It is identified with Hazazon-tamar in II Chron. xx. 2, and was one of the places of refuge of David (I Sam. xxiv. 1).

7. Places Named in Later Records.

This list of places belonging to Judah includes ninety-four "cities," apart from those in the Negeb, but can not be supposed to be exhaustive. Thus the Adoraim of II Chron. xi. 9 does not appear, though it receives frequent mention in the later records. It is the modern Dura, about six miles southwest of Hebron. Another is the Cozeba of I Chron. iv. 22. Later in the history other cities appear, like the Herodia of Herod the Great, sixty stadia south of Jerusalem, with its splendid buildings and its Herodium or tower. Immediately above the coast of the Dead Sea and not quite ten miles south of En-gedi was the fortress Masada, of great importance in Herodian times and in the first century, the site of which is placed at al-Sabba, the ruins of which indicate partly Herodian origins and partly Roman. The northern part of the wilderness of Judea was from the fourth till the seventh century inhabited by thousands of recluses and monks, but to-day has only the single monastery of Mar Saba (founded by Sabas c. 478 A.D.), where are some fifty Greek monks. The names of fifty or sixty establishments for recluses or ascetics have been preserved which were located between the Dead Sea and the watershed to the west. On the west slope of the hill country the city of Eleutheropolis, very often mentioned in the *Onomasticon*, becomes known under its earlier name of Bethgubrin, known still as Bet-Jibrin. This city became somewhat celebrated under Christian rule, and the names of many of its bishops are on record. Its position was at the crossing of several roads between Gaza and Jerusalem, west of Hebron, near the ancient Marasha. After the Arabian conquest it lost its significance, though it is mentioned several times afterward.

1. General Description: Jericho.

2. The Territory of Benjamin: The part of Judea which belonged to the tribe of Benjamin is described in Josh. xviii. 11 sqq. Its southern boundary coincided with the northern boundary of Judah from the Jordan in the east to Kirjath-jearim in the west, its western boundary ran from Kirjath-jearim to Beth-horon, its northern boundary from Beth-horon to the Jordan by Bethel and Jericho, while the Jordan limited it on the east, thus including a territory not quite twelve miles by thirty-one. The region about Jericho was very fruitful, the eastern slope unproductive, the upland poor in water and infertile except the strip between Bethel and Beth-horon. From the west and the north the country is not easily reached, and naturally its population was regarded as warlike and inclined to brigandage (Gen. xlix. 27). The account in Josh. xviii. employs earlier sources, but, when considered historically, raises many difficulties, especially in connection with political relations. The boundary between the two kingdoms fluctuated with the fortunes of the kingdoms themselves; probably the picture in Joshua registers the conditions after the time when the northern kingdom fell. Jerusalem seems to have been connected with the territory of Benjamin, not that of Judah. The cities as described in the Joshua passage fall into two groups, one to the east of twelve cities (verses 21–24) and one to the west of fourteen (verses 25–28). The chief city of the first group is Jericho, called also in some passages "the city of palm-trees" (Deut. xxxiv. 3). The book of Joshua tells of the miraculous capture of the city and of its complete destruction by Joshua, as well as of his imprecation upon the man that should rebuild it. This last item does not agree with statements in Judges iii. 13; II Sam. x. 5; but I Kings xvi. 34 tells of its rebuilding and the realization of the curse by Hiel. A company of prophets made it their home in the time of Elijah and Elisha. It was inhabited after the return (Neh. iii. 2), Bacchides fortified it against Jonathan (I Macc. ix. 50), and in a fortress near by Simon the Maccabee was treacherously murdered. Herod secured possession of the city and beautified it, placing there one of his palaces, though his buildings seem to have been south of the ancient city site. In the time of Josephus the region was a very garden for fertility, watered as it was by the streams of the wady which debouched upon its plain. It was Herod's city at which Jesus rested on his last journey to Jerusalem (Matt. xx. 29), and the *Onomasticon* implies that it was destroyed at the fall of Jerusalem. A new city arose near by, where Justinian built a church, and this was destroyed either by the Persians or the Arabs. The Crusaders erected a city which soon fell into disrepair. In recent times a new era has come to it. The Jordan valley from the Sea of Tiberias to the Dead Sea belongs to the sultan personally, and one of his representatives resides at Jericho. The Russians have a church and a hospice there.

2. The First Group of Benjamite Cities.

A second city in this group was Beth-hoglah, on the boundary line, three Roman miles from Jericho and two from the Jordan, according to the *Onomasticon.* Betharaba lay on the plain of the Jordan, but its site is not recovered. Zemaraim is probably to be sought on the highland south of Bethel (II Chron. xiii. 4). Bethel is the well-known Betin, and the outlook corresponds entirely with the requirements of Gen. xii. 8, xiii. 3–10, xxviii. 18, 22, though the city of the name was necessarily apart from the sanctuary situated there from which the city took its name. It appears as on the boundary between Joseph and Judah, and near it was the oak of weeping by the grave of Deborah (Gen. xxxv. 8). This may have been one of the oldest Yahweh sanctuaries in the highland, and it was selected by Jeroboam as one of the two great sacred places of his realm. There or near by a company of the prophets had its settlement (II Kings ii. 3 sqq.), and the priests sent by the Assyrians to teach the people religion dwelt there (II Kings xvii. 24 sqq.); Josiah destroyed the sanctuary (II Kings xxiii. 15), and Bacchides fortified the place in the Maccabean wars. North of it is a singular group of stones which is recognized by some scholars as a cromlech (Hebr. *Gilgal*). Avvim is sometimes identified with Ai, but without certainty. Para is identified with Fara, a little over nine miles west of Jericho in Wadi Fara. Ophra, probably the same as the place mentioned I Sam. xiii. 17, the Ephron of II Chron. xiii. 19, and the Ephraim of II Sam. xiii. 23, is mentioned in John xi. 54 and Josephus, *War*, IV., ix. 9. Geba is the Gibeah of I Sam. xiii. 16, the present Jeba, to be distinguished from the Gibeath of Josh. xviii. 28.

3. The Second Group.

The second group of Benjamite cities includes, according to the Hebrew, fourteen places, according to the Septuagint, thirteen (not all the same as the Hebrew). Gibeon comes very often into notice in the history of the people. It formed one of a league of cities at the time of the conquest, and its inhabitants are called Hivites (Josh. ix. 7). It had a notable sanctuary (I Kings iii. 4 sqq.), became one of the priestly cities, and by indications from the *Onomasticon* is placed at al-Jib about five and a half miles north of Jerusalem, occupying the northern peak of a twin hill. Ramah lay north of Jerusalem and Gibeath, on the road that leads northward, a border town between Israel and Judah in the time of Asa. The tomb of Rachel seems to have been in the vicinity (Jer. xxxi. 15). The *Onomasticon* places it six Roman miles north of Jerusalem, opposite Bethel, the modern al-Ram, the site of old ruins. Beeroth ("wells") was one of the places which joined in the league with Gibeon (Josh. ix. 17), but was evacuated before the Benjamites (II Sam. iv. 3). The *Onomasticon* locates it seven Roman miles from Jerusalem on the road to Nicopolis which leads from Jerusalem by Gibeon and Beth-horon to the western plain. This suits better than the location of al-Bira, eleven Roman miles north of Jerusalem near Bethel. Mizpeh was fortified by Asa against the northern kingdom, and was the residence of Gedaliah after 586 B.C. (I Kings xv. 22; II Kings xxv. 23). It is frequently mentioned in both the earlier and the later annals of the people, and lay on the road from Jerusalem to

Shechem, and, according to the *Onomasticon*, near Kirjath-jearim. Robinson places it at the lofty Nabi Samwil, two miles south of Gibeon, where is a village and a mosque said to contain the tomb of Samuel. In Byzantine times this was the site assigned to Rama or Ramathaim, and the Crusaders built here a church of St. Samuel, changed into a mosque by the Mohammedans. Chephirah is the modern Kafira, north of Kirjath-jearim. Mozah is placed by the Talmud at the modern Kaloniye, near which is a Bet Mizza, which, however, does not fit the situation. Zelah is given (II Sam. xxi. 14) as the place of Saul's burial, but is unidentified. The Gibeath of Josh. xviii. 28 is not to be confused with the Geba of verse 24, but is to be placed near Ramah (ut sup.). The Kirjath of Josh. xviii. 28 is probably shortened from Kirjathjearim.

4. Other Places of Note.

This list does not include all the cities which belonged to Benjamin. In the plain of the Jordan lay the sanctuary of Gilgal, often mentioned in both early and late annals. The Hebrew generally uses the article with the word, hence it is not a proper name, but signifies merely a " circle " (of stones). It was a locus of significant historical events at the conquest (Josh. iv.–v.), and, according to the *Onomasticon*, lay two Roman miles from Jericho, between it and the Jordan. The name lingers in the vicinity as Jaljul or Jiljuliye. Dok (Docus), a fortress of Maccabean times (I Macc. xvi. 15) seems to be Ain Duk at the northeast foot of Jebel Karantal, preserved also in the accounts of the early Christian monasteries and as a Templar's fortress. I Sam. xiii.–xiv. brings into prominence a Michmash which reappears in post-exilic times (Ezra ii. 27; I Macc. ix. 73); the name is preserved in the present Mahmas. North of this is the modern Makrun, which recalls the Migron of Isa. x. 28. Near the large village of Der Diwan is the site of Ai (Josh. vii.–viii.), which reappears in history as Aiath or Ai (Isa. x. 28; Ezra ii. 28); the exact location is disputed. Northeast of Der Diwan is a rocky height called Rammon, which recalls the old Rimmon (Judges xx. 45). South of Jeba (ut sup.) is a village, Hizma, the name of which reminds of Azmaveth (Ezra ii. 24; Neh. xii. 29, cf. vii. 28, Beth-azmaveth). Anata, an hour northeast of Jerusalem, suggests Anathoth (Jer. i. 1). Other place-names are Laishah (Isa. x. 30), Almon (Josh. xxi. 18), and Bahurim (II Sam. xvi. 5). Two places on the Mount of Olives are often mentioned in the history of Jesus. Bethany was two and a half miles from Jerusalem, on the road to Jericho, on the eastern slope of the mountain, the modern al-Azariya (" Place of Lazarus "), where the grave of Lazarus and the house of Martha and Mary are still shown. Not far from Bethany lay Bethphage (Matt. xxi. 1), the site of which was shown in the time of the Crusades between Bethany and the summit of the mountain. To the west or northwest must have lain Emmaus, the scene of the events told in Luke xxiv. 13 sqq., which the *textus receptus* places sixty furlongs from Jerusalem but *Codex Sinaiticus* 160 furlongs. Josephus (*War*, VII., vi. 6) mentions a place of the name thirty furlongs from the city, while the Crusaders in 1099 knew of a Castle of Emmaus which is identified with the modern al-Kubaba, about sixty-three furlongs from Jerusalem. Hitzig and Sepp located Emmaus at Kaluniyeh, called in the Talmud Mosa, thirty-four furlongs from the capital. Somewhere within the territory of Benjamin should be placed the grave of Rachel. Gen. xxxv. 16, 21 reports that Rachel died between Bethel and the tower of Eder (Jerusalem) on the road to Bethel, north of Jerusalem, with which agrees Jer. xxxi. 15. On the other hand, Gen. xxxv. 19, xlviii. 7 connect the grave with Ephrath or Bethlehem, where the tomb is still shown. But Schick has shown that the Mohammedan sanctuary Kubbat Abd al-Aziz, northwest of Jersualem, is also called Kubbat Rahil and corresponds better with the earlier data.

3. The Judean Territory of Dan (Josh. xix. 40–46): Though the boundaries are not given, it is known that the eastern boundary coincided with the western boundary of Benjamin, its southern border with the western part of the north boundary of Judah, and its northern limits extended to the southern boundary of Ephraim from Beth-horon by Gezer to the sea, reckoning Joppa as part of the territory of Dan. Judges v. 17 places Dan on the coast, i. 34 states that the Amorites forced them back, and chap. xviii. tells of a migration of 600 men to near the sources of the Jordan, while elsewhere places are assigned to Dan which some other parts of Scripture give to Judah or Ephraim. This is the case with the first two towns on the list, Zorah and Eshtaol. Ir-shemesh is the same as Beth-shemesh, a place which is often named in the history, is put by the *Onomasticon* east of the tenth milestone on the road to Eleutheropolis, and agrees with the modern uninhabited Ain Shams, where ruins are still to be found, on the south side of the Wadi al-Surar. Shaalabin (Shaalbim, Judges i. 35) has been located, probably wrongly, at Selbit, southwest of Beth-horon. Aijalon appears in the history often as a fortress, also as a city of refuge and Levitical city, and as belonging either to Ephraim or Benjamin. The *Onomasticon* locates it two Roman miles east of Emmaus-Nicopolis, the modern Jalu two miles east of Amwas. The plain of Aijalon lies to the north of the village. Timnah is probably the same as the Timnah of Josh. xv. 10, west of Beth-shemesh, and in the history is connected with the Philistines and with the campaign of Sennacherib in 701 B.C. Ekron is the well-known city of the Philistines, which in Josh. xv. 45 is reckoned to Judah. Eltekeh, a Levitical city (Josh. xxi. 23), corresponds to the Altaku, where Sennacherib overthrew a hostile army, but its site is not known. Gibbethon, also a Levitical city, is not identified. Jehud is located at al-Yehudiya, north of Lydda and east of Jaffa, while Bene-berak is Ibn Ibrak near Jaffa. Westward of Jalu is the little village Amwas, the name of which corresponds to Emmaus, a place often in question in the Maccabean wars, situated on the western edge of the highland, known as Nicopolis about 250, often mentioned in the *Onomasticon*. Gezer (q.v.) is named Josh. x. 33; Judges i. 29; I Kings ix. 15–17, and often elsewhere, is called one of the border cities of Joseph, and appears as belonging to Ephraim, as a Levitical city, of importance during the Davidic and Maccabean wars, and is located by Clermont-Ganneau four miles west of Amwas at Tell al-Jezar.

4. The Judean Territory of Ephraim: The most northern part of Judea as already defined took in a part of the territory of Ephraim, the rest of which was reckoned to Samaria. There is no list of the places in this region, but of many cities there is incidental mention. Josephus mentions Phasaelis, a town in the Jordan valley built by Herod in honor of his brother Phasael, the name of which survives in that of the village Fazail, south of the hill Karn Sartaba. The fortress Alexandrium crowned the summit of this hill and was of importance in the war of Pompey. Akrabatta is mentioned by Josephus (*War*, III., iii. 5) and in the *Onomasticon:* it is the modern Akraba. Janoah of Josh. xvi. 6 corresponds to the present Janun, north of Akraba. Borkaios, mentioned by Josephus (*War*, III., iii. 5) as on the boundary between Judea and Galilee, is possibly the heap of ruins at Barkit, in Wadi Ishar. To the southwest of this is al-Lubban, corresponding to the Lebonah of Judges xxi. 19. Farther southeast is Sailun, which points to the old sanctuary of Shiloh, apparently destroyed in the Philistine war, since the descendants of Eli (II Sam. xxi.) went to Nob; yet the priestly document regards Shiloh as the place of the Tabernacle. The *Onomasticon* locates Shiloh ten Roman miles from Neapolis: it was north of Bethel and east of the road to Shechem. To the west of the road and southwest from al-Lubban lies Jiljilya, recalling another of the places called in the history Gilgal. Farther to the south lies Ain Sinya, the Jeshanah of II Chron. xiii. 19, and near by is Jifna, which suggests the Gophna of Josephus, *War*, I., xi. 2. To the northwest is the heap of ruins called Tibna, perhaps the Thamnatha of I Macc. ix. 50, known also from the *Onomasticon*, which locates there the tomb of Joshua (the Timnath-heres of Judges ii. 9). Not far to the north of this is Rima, possibly the Ramah of I Sam. xvi. 13, the Ramathaim of I Sam. i. 1, the Ramathem of I Macc. xi. 34, and the Arimathea of Mark xv. 43. But the *Onomasticon* locates it toward the modern Rentis (6 m. w. of Tibnah). The two Beth-horons of the Old Testament (Josh. xvi. 3, 5) are located farther to the south at Bait Ur al-Fuka and Bait Ur al-Tahta. The upper Beth-horon, by reason of its commanding the road from Jerusalem to Cæsarea and the coast, was of high importance in all periods and is mentioned prominently in the accounts of the wars from the time of Joshua to the Roman period. At al-Midya, on the plain northwest of Beth-horon, is ordinarily located the home of the Maccabees, the Modin of I Macc. ii. 1, xiii. 25, with its seven pyramids to the memory of the members of that family.

5. Cities on the Western Plain: There were other places in the plain west of the highland which in later times were reckoned to Judah, but do not appear in the lists of places given in Joshua. Indeed, the assignment of the places named in the Joshua lists is not entirely concordant with that of other passages. Doubtless the possession of these places on the plain was often contested with the Philistines. So was it with Gimzo (II Chron. xxviii. 18), the modern Jimzu north of Gezer. The Hadid of Ezra ii. 33 may be the Aditha of the *Onomasticon*, east of Diospolis, the present al-Hadithe, and perhaps the Adida of I Macc. xii. 38. Lod, mentioned with Hadid in the Ezra passage, is the Greek Lydda, is often assigned in the Old Testament to the Benjamites, was ceded with its outlying region to Jonathan the Maccabee by Demetrius (I Macc. xi. 34), and was an object of strife between the Jews and the Romans. It is mentioned in Acts ix. 32 sqq., and after the destruction of Jerusalem became the residence of Jewish scholars, for example, of Rabbi Eliezer. In the third century it took the name of Diospolis and became thereafter the seat of a bishopric. The legend of St. George was localized here. The present Ludd is a town inhabited by Mohammedans and Greeks, not far from the road from Jerusalem to Jaffa. Ono, also mentioned in the Ezra passage, may be the modern Kafr Ana, five and a half miles northwest of Ludd. On the northern boundary of the later Judea lay Antipatris, a city built and named by Herod in honor of his father: it is mentioned Acts xxiii. 31. The pilgrim of Bordeaux locates it ten Roman miles north of Lydda, the *Onomasticon* six miles south of Galgulis, the modern Jiljuliya in the plain northeast of Jaffa. A passage in Josephus would suggest Kalat Ras al-Ain as the site. Ten miles north of this is Kafr Saba, recalling the Chaberzaba of Josephus (*Ant.* XIII., xv. 1).

6. The Eleven Toparchies of Judea According to Josephus: In *War*, III., iii. 5 Josephus names as the first district of Judea Jerusalem with its vicinity. The others are (2) Gophna, (3) Akrabatta, (4) Thamna, (5) Lydda, (6) Emmaus, (7) Pella, (8) Idumea, (9) Engedi, (10) Herodium, and (11) Jericho. Pliny (*Hist. naturalis*, V., xiv. 70) names ten, including 2–6 and 10–11 above, and gives in addition to these Jopica (Jaffa), Betholethephene, and Orine. The last includes the district of the capital. Josephus mentions a Betholethepha (*War*, IV., viii. 1), which is probably the present Bait Nattif west of Bethlehem on the edge of the highland and the Netophah of Ezra ii. 22 and other Old-Testament passages. Therefore Pella above seems to be replaced by Betholethepha. Pliny was in error in assigning the region of Joppa to Judea, since it was independent. For the coast region which abutted on Judean territory see PHILISTINES; and PHENICIA, PHENICIANS. (H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Literature on the history is given under AHAB; ISRAEL, HISTORY OF; to which add: H. Kosters, *Het Herstel van Israel*, Leyden, 1893; H. Willrich, *Juden und Griechen vor der makkabäischen Erhebung*, Göttingen, 1895; E. Meyer, *Die Entstehung des Judentums*, Halle, 1896. For the geography much of the literature given under Jerusalem is available. Of peculiar value are the works of Röhricht, Tobler, G. A. Smith, E. Robinson, W. M. Thomson, and Reland, as well as the publications of the Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society, described in vol. i., p. 13 of this work, and the publications of the Société de l'orient Latin, ed. T. Tobler and A. Molinier, Geneva, 1877–80. The following publications of the PEF are of importance: *The Survey of Western Palestine; Memoirs*, vols. ii.–iii., 1882–83; *Thirty Years' Work*, 1895; C. Clermont-Ganneau, *Archæological Researches*, 1896–99; G. Armstrong, *Names and Places in the Old and New Testa-*

ments and Apocrypha; the *Quarterly Statements;* and, of their maps, the *Great Map of Western Palestine*, the *Photo-Relief Map of Palestine*, and the *Raised Map of Palestine*. Indispensable are: *Onomastica sacra*, ed. P. de Lagarde, Göttingen, 1887; A. Neubauer, *La Géographie du Talmud*, Paris, 1868; V. Guérin, *Description de la Palestine*, i.–ii., Paris, 1868–75. A very convenient check-list of place-names is given in P. Thomsen, *Loca sancta. Verzeichnis der im 1.–6. Jahrhundert erwähnten Ortschaften Palästinas*, vol. i., Halle, 1907; cf. idem, *Systematische Bibliographie der Palästina-Literatur*, Leipsic, 1908. A considerable literature of travel may be found in J. F. Hurst, *Literature of Theology*, pp. 119–130, New York, 1896. Consult further: C. Ritter, *Comparative Geography of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula*, iii., 174–350, Edinburgh, 1866; G. Ebers and H. Guthe, *Palästina in Bild und Wort*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1881–83; F. Buhl, *Geographie des alten Palästina*, Tübingen, 1896; F. J. Bliss, *Development of Palestine Exploration*, New York, 1906; *DB*, ii. 791–792; *EB*, ii. 2616–2623; K. Baedeker, *Palestine and Syria*, Leipsic, 1906.

On Hebron consult: M. de Vogüé, *Macpéla ou tombeau des patriarches à Hebron*, Lausanne, 1869; E. Pierotti, *Macpéla ou tombeau des patriarches à Hebron*, ib. 1869; E. Rosen, in *Berliner Zeitschrift für allgemeine Erdku-de*, xiv (1863), 369–429, xv (1864), 160–162; idem, in *ZDMG*, xii (1858), 477–513; H. Guthe, in *ZDPV*, xvii (1894), 238 sqq. On Gilgal: H. Zschokke, *Beiträge zur Topographie der westlichen Jordansau*, Jerusalem, 1866. On Bethphage: C. Clermont-Ganneau, in *Revue archéologique*, December, 1877. On Emmaus: H. Zschokke, *Das neutestamentliche Emmaus*, Schaffhausen, 1865; M. J. Schiffers, *Amwas, das Emmaus des heiligen Lucas*, Freiburg, 1890; H. Guthe, in *ZDPV*, xvi (1893), 298 sqq. On Mizpeh: P. A. Raboisson, *Les Maspeh. Étude de géographie exégétique touchant les différentes localités de ce nom*, Paris, 1897. Also see Gezer.

JUDGES.

I. The Office.
  General Concept (§ 1).
  Character of the Period (§ 2).
  History of the Period (§ 3).
  Chronology of the Judges (§ 4).
II. The Book.
  1. Conservative View.
    Divisions; the Narrative (§ 1).
    Critical View Rejected (§ 2).
  2. Critical View.
    Analysis (§ 1).
    Idealizing (§ 2).
    The History (§ 3).

1. General Concept.

I. The Office: Judges (Hebr. *shopheṭim*) was the name applied to the rulers of Israel at the time described in the book of Judges (see II. below). They find their analogues in the "judges" of the Tyrians (Josephus, *Apion*, i. 21) and in the Carthaginian *sufetes* (Livy, xxviii. 37, xxx. 7); they must not be regarded, however, as heads of regularly organized states, but rather as dictators who, having first evidenced their capabilities by their prowess, naturally became the leaders of a tribe or group of tribes. In time of peace their function was primarily the decision of cases which could not be settled by the "elders"; and some of them, such as Deborah (Judges iv. 4) and Samuel (I Sam. vii. 6), were judges by virtue of their prophetic gifts even before they became the liberators of their countrymen; while others, as Samson, seem never to have delivered judgment. The name, however, was borne by the rulers of the Israelites from the conquest of Canaan by Joshua to the establishment of the kingdom, with the exception of Abimelech, the son of Gideon, who seems to have had the title of king (Judges ix.).

2. Character of the Period.

The character of the period of the Judges is outlined in the introduction to the book of Judges, especially ii. 10 sqq. After the subjection of the chief Canaanitic peoples, the Israelites had relaxed their energies, and had entered into friendly relations in many cases with their former foes. The result was an oppressive subjugation of the Israelites, until they remembered God, who raised up judges to deliver them. Nevertheless, as soon as a judge passed away, his influence vanished, and the people returned to their coquetry with the surrounding nations, again falling into political and spiritual bondage. The period was also characterized by a centrifugal tendency both in national and religious life. It was the time when the tribes enjoyed the greatest freedom, and only when mutual perils united them did they recollect their common origin and invoke their common God. The tendencies of the time thus powerfully favored the confusion of the worship of Yahweh and Baal, as well as of other gods whose symbols, oracles, and cult were openly adopted; but, on the other hand, the horrors resulting from gentile immorality were washed out in blood (Judges xix.–xx.), and faith prompted the vows of mighty sacrifices (Judges xi. 31; I Sam. i. 11). In like manner, low though the culture of the Israelites sank during this period of storm and stress, the power of the nation was still strong and unbroken. It was an age of heroes, not only physical but moral, finding exemplification in the Song of Deborah, the fable of Jotham, and the humor of Samson. Nor was the disunion of the Israelites at this period, as some maintain, a preliminary to their development as a nation, for the Song of Deborah itself clearly shows a strong consciousness of the religious and national homogeneity of the tribes.

3. History of the Period.

The period of the Judges was opened by an eight years' subjugation of Israel by Chushan-rishathaim of Aram-naharaim (Judges iii. 8), apparently a king of the Mitanni (A. H. Sayce, *The Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, pp. 297, 304, London, 1894) who repeatedly sought to establish themselves in Canaan against Egypt. The Israelites were delivered from this yoke by Othniel, the son of Kenaz, who dwelt in the south (Judges i. 12–13), after which there followed forty years of peace (Judges iii. 9–11). During this period of repose, two events happened which, although related at the end of the book of Judges, can not have taken place long after Joshua's death: the migration of a portion of the tribe of Dan, prevented by the hostile Amorites from occupying their territory along the sea (Judges i. 34), to the north, where they founded the city of Laish, or Dan (the modern Tell al-Kadi, west of Banias), and introduced an idolatrous cult (Judges xviii.); and the war of revenge on Benjamin for the outrage committed in Gibeah (Judges xix.–xx.). Others, however, place both these events before the Mesopotamian invasion (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* V., ii. 8 sqq., iii. 1); but there is no ground for the view that these episodes are later interpolations. After the death of Othniel at the expiration of the forty years' peace, the Israelites were again subjugated for eighteen years by the combined Moabites, Ammonites, and Amalekites, until the Benjamite Ehud killed the Moabite King Eglon (Judges iii. 12 sqq.). Eighty years of peace followed, after which the Israelites were subject for twenty years to the Canaanitic Jabin and Sisera, to which period belongs the heroic deed of Shamgar, which freed a portion of the land from the oppression of the Philistines (Judges iii. 31; cf. v. 6). Relief from their bondage, which by some is held to be Hittite, was brought to Israel, especially in the north, by the prophetess and judge Deborah, who roused Barak to war against Jabin and Sisera (Judges iv. 2 sqq.); though the tribes east of the Jordan, as well as Dan and some on the sea, took no part in the struggle for freedom (Judges v. 15 sqq.); while Judah seems to have been prevented from cooperating by its own war with the Philistines. Another forty years of peace ensued; but then the Midianites and other nomadic tribes invaded the plain of Jezreel, oppressing the Israelites for seven years, until they were driven out by Gideon (Judges vi.–vii.). Gideon piously declined the proffered kingship (Judges viii. 22 sqq.; but after his death his unworthy son Abimelech brought misfortune on his house (Judges ix.). Abimelech was followed by Tola, of the tribe of Issachar, who ruled twenty-three years (Judges x. 1 sqq.), and by Jair, a Gileadite, who was judge twenty-two years (x. 3–5). With the death of Jair, Israel was oppressed on the east by the Ammonites and on the west by the Philistines. The former, after oppressing Israel eighteen years, were conquered by Jephthah (Judges x.–xi.), who was also later involved in a civil war with the tribe of Ephraim (Judges xii. 1 sqq.). He ruled in peace only seven years, and was succeeded by Izban of Bethlehem (seven years), Elon, a Zebulonite (ten years), and Abdon, an Ephraimite (eight years; Judges xii. 8 sqq.). After their rule, the Philistines oppressed Israel forty years (Judges xiii. 1), their deliverer being the hero Samson (Judges xiii.–xvi.). The power of the Philistines revived, however, in the latter part of the judgeship of Eli, who ruled forty years (I Sam. iv. 18), and they were crushed only by Samuel and the kings anointed by him. The thread of the book of Judges breaks off with the death of Samson, and, although Eli is said to have "judged" Israel, and the same is stated concerning Samuel (I Sam. vii. 6, viii. 1 sqq., xii. 1 sqq.), they form the transition from the judges to the kings.

4. Chronology of the Judges.

The chronology of this period is difficult. The period given by the book of Judges from the subjugation by Chushan-rishathaim (Judges iii. 8) to the death of Samson (xvi. 31) is 410 years; but this is far too long when compared with I Kings vi. 1, which gives only 480 years for the time from the Exodus to the commencement of the Temple in the fourth year of the reign of Solomon, including the forty years in the wilderness, the equal length of David's reign, and the unknown duration of the rule of Samuel, Saul, etc. The best explanation of these conflicting data seems to be the synchronization of Judges x. 8 sqq. with xiii. 1 sqq., thus placing the oppression by the Philistines at the same time as that by the Ammonites, and regarding Samson as the contemporary of Jephthah, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon; with a resultant reduction of the 140 years to about 360 (cf. Judges x. 6 sqq.; the figures in Judges xi. 26 would then be round numbers). It is also tempting to assume a further synchronism between the forty years' oppression by the Philistines (Judges xiii. 1) and the rule of Eli and the early part of Samuel's judgeship, thus reducing the period to about 340 years. See TIME, BIBLICAL RECKONING OF.

1. Divisions; the Narrative.

II. The Book: 1. Conservative View: In its present form this book is relatively late, although its oldest sources date from the events they describe. It falls into three parts: an introduction (i.–iii. 6); the main portion, a unified narrative (iii. 7–xvi.); and two additions (xvii.–xxi.). The introduction treats of the general condition of Israel after the death of Joshua and gives the underlying relation of the stormy events of the period, together with the occupation of the land by the tribes (i.) and their impious toleration of the former inhabitants (ii. 1–5). In ii. 6 the thread of the narrative is taken up, with a preliminary prophetic description of the period (ii. 6–23). A list of the peoples still unsubdued is given in iii. 1–6, this passage being by another hand. Nevertheless, it is clear that the redactor deliberately planned the introduction in its present form, and that he interwove fragments of other historical writings wherever he thought best, doubtless drawing from some source common to Judges and Joshua (cf. Judges i. 10–15 with Josh. xv. 14–19; Judges i. 20 with Josh. xv. 13; Judges i. 21 with Josh. xv. 63; Judges i. 27–28 with Josh. xvii. 11 sqq.; Judges i. 29 with Josh. xvi. 10). The main portion narrates six great events, the heroes of which are Othniel, the conqueror of the Arameans (iii. 7 sqq.); Ehud, the liberator from the Moabites (iii. 12 sqq.); the victory of Deborah and Barak over Jabin and Sisera (iv.–v.); Gideon and his sons (vi.–ix.); Jephthah's victory over the Ammonites (x. 6 sqq., xi.–xii.); and Samson, the hero against the Philistines (xiii.–xvi.). Six other judges are also briefly mentioned. The two additions on the sanctuary at Dan (xvii.–xviii.) and the war against Benjamin (xix.–xxi.) seem to have been written by one who lived in the flourishing period of the kings (cf. xviii. 1, xix. 1, xxi. 25).

2. Critical View Rejected.

It is assumed by the majority of modern scholars that the redactor of the book of Judges had two systems of chronology before him: one of generations of forty years each; and the other of smaller, but more accurate, figures. These two systems were then interwoven, the smaller being assumed to refer to the periods of subjugation, and the larger to the rules of the judges. But the problem is still unsolved, although it would seem that the apparently over-long period arose from the addition of contemporaneous periods, and that the number forty is only approximate. The critical school has assailed not only the chronology, but also the historicity of the book of Judges. Thus Othniel, Ehud, Tola, Jair, and Elon are resolved into "eponymous heroes"; but in no case is the evidence favorable to the theories of this school. On the contrary, the book gives an impression of relative unity and independence; nor is it to be regarded as an extract from some larger work, extending from Joshua's death (or from the Creation) to the Exile. Equally untenable is a derivation of the book from J and E, and their combination into JE. Since, on the other hand, the Deuteronomic redactor was not the first to combine the accounts given in the book, the question of its date admits of no single answer. The redactor doubtless lived in the period of the later kings; but there is no evidence to show that the book belongs to the exilic or post-exilic period. Textually the book of Judges is one of the best preserved of all the historical writings. Nevertheless, a comparison with the versions, especially the Septuagint, shows noteworthy variants, especially in proper names. So ancient a fragment as the Song of Deborah naturally gives more scope to textual criticism, although here also great caution is necessary. C. VON ORELLI.

1. Analysis.

2. Critical View: A cursory reading of the book of Judges shows that it consists of two main elements, one of these containing stories and historical notices without comment, and the other comprising detailed narratives with an explicit or implicit commentary on the events described. The latter, comprising most of the book, extends from iii. 7 to xvi. 31, and has a prefatory note containing the moral of the history (ii. 6–iii. 6). It is this main portion which not only gives character to the book as a whole but also explains its aim and motive. It is written to show, in the Deuteronomic spirit, the course of Israel's history before the movement began which ended in the founding of the kingdom—how fidelity to Yahweh and his commandments was invariably attended by prosperity, and how calamity, especially by the inroads and oppressions of national enemies, surely followed false worship and impiety, according to the principles laid down in Deut. xxviii. All the lives of the "Judges" are narrated in this principal section. The introduction (i. 1–ii. 5) is quite different in character and style, not only running parallel to portions of the book of Joshua (see JOSHUA, BOOK OF) but actually giving a divergent account of the conquest of the Canaanites. Quite different also, and falling as clearly without the sphere of the Deuteronomistic compiler, are the last five chapters (xvii.–xxi.) which narrate important events belonging to the early period of the occupation of Canaan, and therefore out of the chronological order followed by the author of the main part of the book. Both the introduction and the conclusion are lacking in the religious and homiletic comments which dominate chaps. iii. 7–xvi. 31.

2. Idealizing.

The most important question for the Bible student is the amount and degree of the idealizing of history which are employed in the book in its present form. The introduction (i. 1–ii. 5) contains a plain narrative of facts of the highest value; only the fact must be noted that the words in i. 1 "after the death of Joshua" are a late gloss due to a misunderstanding of the historical situation, for, as ii. 6–9 shows, the events described here took place during the life of Joshua. Chaps. xvii.–xviii. are also of great importance for the early political and religious condition of Israel and contain merely a statement of facts, which set forth the causes and incidents connected with the migration northward of the tribe of Dan and the founding of the city of that name at the point which became the northerly limit of Israel and the seat of a famous sanctuary. Chaps. xix.–xxi. are a highly embellished account of some incidents which occurred in the early days of the settlement, an outrage perpetrated by some members of the tribe of Benjamin (chap. xix.) and avenged by the other tribes (xx., xxi.). Chap. xix. would appear to rest on a considerable basis of fact, but the last two chapters are full of numerical exaggerations; they represent Israel as forming a political and religious unit at a very early date, and they give other evidences of a priestly authorship. Thus it must be assumed that certain old traditions were worked over in them at a late date in conformity with the spirit of the priest code.

3. The History.

The stories which make the main part of the book so readable are at the same time the source of nearly all direct knowledge of the period between the settlement and the founding of the kingdom. They belong in their original form to some of the earliest collections of prose compositions in the literature of Israel. Beginning with the deliverances effected by Othniel (iii. 7–11) and Ehud (iii. 12–30), the motive of the collection comes out more clearly in the story of the final suppression of the Canaanites under Deborah and Barak. This is given in its original form in the oldest long poem of the Bible (chap. v.), the prose version which was of course later being found in chap. iv. The poem is our best authority for the condition and activity of the tribes of Israel about 1130 B.C. Of equal importance is the great story of Gideon and his deliverance of his tribesmen from the oppression of the Midianites (chaps. vi.–viii.). The sequel of their expulsion is specially instructive since it shows how the tribes felt themselves helpless in their disunion and were conscious of their need of hereditary "judges" or kings. The fact that here as elsewhere in the book more than one version of the original tradition was drawn upon is illustrated by the variations of vii. 24–viii. 3 and viii. 4–21, the latter being the briefer or earlier account. The history of Samson (xiii.–xvi.) dealing as it does with the period of Philistine domination over western Judah brings the account one step nearer to the epoch of the monarchy; but the subject lent itself so much to romance and legend that it is more difficult to learn the real facts behind this story than elsewhere in the book. In any case the Samson episodes form, from the historical point of view, merely a preparation to the history of Eli and Samuel, who carried on the contest with the Philistines till the crowning of King Saul. Thus the closing of the original book of Judges was really the beginning of a history which began with Samson (cf. xiii. 5) and ended with I Sam. xii. It was then a Deuteronomistic editor who compiled the first edition of the book, beginning with ii. 6 and unifying the whole by his "pragmatic" treatment of the stories and his assumption of the solidarity of "Israel" under the régime of the successive judges, each of whom actually "judged" only a portion of the country occupied by the disunited tribes. The post-exilic priestly redactor prefixed chaps. i. 1–ii. 5, added chaps. xvii.–xxi., and the allusions to the minor judges, six in number (iii. 31, x. 1–5, xii. 8–15). These with the six judges of the original work (Othniel, Ehud, Barak, Gideon, Samson, Jephthah) make up the ideal number twelve. The story of Abimelech (chap. ix.), which is an episode in the history of the old Canaanitic city of Shechem, lies without the general scheme of the book and is probably a later addition. It is valuable as showing how readily the idea of kingship was embraced by the common people, and still more valuable for the parable of Jotham (verses 8–15) which shows that despotic rule was estimated at its real worth even in those early times.

As to the chronology of the book it is hopeless to attempt to reduce the given numbers of years to any reasonable scheme (see TIME, BIBLICAL RECKONING OF). The best that can be done is to take the probable date of the eastern invasion (about 1170 B.C.) and the accession of David (about 1000 B.C.) as two working extremes, within which approximation to the facts may be reached by placing Deborah and Barak about 1130, Gideon about 1100, Jephthah about 1080, Samuel about 1050, Saul about 1030 B.C. J. F. MCCURDY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the history of the Judges consult the literature under AHAB: the commentaries named below; C. Piepenbring, *Hist. du peuple d'Israel*, Paris, 1898. The three indispensable commentaries are: G. F. Moore, New York, 1895 (high-water mark in critical exegesis); K. Budde, Tübingen, 1897 (thorough); and W. Nowack, Göttingen, 1900 (also excellent). Other commentaries are: G. L. Studer, Bern, 1842; C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, Edinburgh, 1865; J. Bachmann, Berlin, 1868–69; Hervey, in *Bible Commentary*, London, 1872; P. Cassel, in Lange, New York, 1875; E. Reuss, Paris, 1877; J. J. Lias, in *Cambridge Bible*, Cambridge, 1882; E. Bertheau, Leipsic, 1883; A. R. Fausset, London, 1885; S. Oettli, Munich, 1893; G. H. S. Walpole, London, 1901; M. J. Lagrange, Paris, 1903.

On questions of introduction consult the works mentioned in and under BIBLICAL INTRODUCTION; T. Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des A. T.*, pp. 173–198, Kiel, 1869; E. Meyer, in *ZATW*, i (1881), 117–146; J. C. A. Kessler, *Chronologia judicum et primorum regum*, Leipsic, 1885; S. R. Driver, in *JQR*, i (1889), pp. 258–270; G. A. Cooke, *Hist. and Song of Deborah*, London, 1892; R. Kittel, in *TSK*, lxv (1892), 44–71; P. de Lagarde, *Septuagintastudien*, pp. 1–72, Göttingen, 1892; W. Frankenberg, *Die Composition des . . . Richterbuchs*, Marburg, 1895; F. Perles, *Analekten zur Textkritik des A. T.*, Munich, 1895; C. Bruston, *Le Cantique de Deborah*, Paris, 1901; *DB*, ii. 807–820; *EB*, ii. 2633–42; *JE*, vii. 375–381.

JUDGMENT, DIVINE: The final expression of God's will respecting man's future destiny. The idea of judgment in the Old Testament presupposes a transcendent God and a divine interest in the moral order of the world, and was drawn from the analogy of human justice. The divine judgment which precedes the Messianic kingdom is concerned with guilty angels, with Gentiles to be destroyed or to become subject to Israel, with Israel and Judah as nations for which their enemies were to be employed as instruments of retribution, and with individuals of whom a remnant would be saved. The scene is the earthly life. To this judgment evils of various kinds were referred (cf. Job; also Luke xiii. 1 sqq.). Later the judgment was conceived of as following the Messianic kingdom (cf. Psalms of Solomon, i.–xviii., Eng. transl. in *Presbyterian Review*, iv. 1883, 775 sqq.). In Alexandrian Judaism no distant final judgment is taught—each soul goes at death to its true place. In the New Testament the final judgment is connected with the parousia of Christ, yet the judgment is there both present and future. The judge is represented as either God or Christ, and judgment is according to works as expressive of character. In the teachings of Jesus this note is repeatedly struck especially in the parables, and apostolic preaching resounds with it. All men appear to be the subjects of it, and not those only who have known Christ (II Cor v. 10; Matt. xxv. 31 sqq.). One aspect of the judgment is that it creates nothing but only discloses what already exists, i.e., the relation of the person and his deeds to the divine moral order. There are particular judgments which, however overwhelming in themselves—the flood, the downfall of Sodom and of Jerusalem—are not final but only prefigurations of the last judgment. The New Testament knows of no gradation through imperceptible stages of judgment from highest to lowest; all men are either within or without the kingdom of God. One is warned against self-deception and against hasty judgment respecting others (Matt. vii.; Rom. xiv. 7–12). A person may be unconscious of his real actions or character, but these will come to light and receive retribution. The full realization may be long delayed, but no stage of the process is indifferent and the end will surely come. There is no evidence of a private judgment at death.

Scriptural Idea.

The Nature of Judgment.

The central idea embodied in the various pictures of judgment is that of human responsibility and of infallible retribution. This rests upon the conviction of an indestructible moral order, of laws as expressive of a personal divine will, and of Christ in such essential relation to mankind that God will have no one reach his final destiny apart from Christ. Yet according to the Scriptures the judgment is not final in the sense that ethical development has reached its limit, but only so far as this is conceived as related to the consummation of the kingdom of God. This is a teleological view of man's life in which he is lifted above the necessitated causal order, offered a divine goal, albeit a flying one, as the aim of ethical endeavor, and bidden to rely only upon an all-seeing, righteous God for recompense. The process is essentially teleological, so that, as Schiller declared, the history of the world is the judgment of the world.

Theories of Judgment.

Two general theories of judgment have been proposed: (1) The common view, which is set forth in the following positions. (a) It takes place at a definite moment—immediately after the general resurrection (see RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD). (b) It will be universal; the whole human race is to appear, each one in the completeness of personal life, "body, soul, and spirit." (c) It will be public—the grounds of it open and evident to all; whether sins of the saints will be disclosed may be left in question. (d) The decision will be based on the deeds done in the body; probation has ended at death. (e) The law of judgment will be the will of God as it has been severally revealed to all men: to those under the written law, by that law; to those without that law, by the law in their hearts; to those under the Christian revelation, by what they have known of it. (f) It will be final and thus fix the changeless state of all—the good in felicity, the wicked in wo. (g) The hour when this is to occur is unknown, but is purposely retained within the secret counsel of God. A modification of this view, while conceiving of the parousia of Christ as a spiritual process and the resurrection as the rising of each man to life after death, holds that there is no other judgment than that which occurs at death. (2) The other idea of judgment presents it as a process which endures as long as law and moral being endure. It involves experience of good and evil results of choice, and the revelation of the nature of these within the moral consciousness. The conscience is the seat of this solemn process. By means of it all that opposes the will of God is gradually disclosed, condemned, and separated from the good, so that the good progressively triumphs. The results of this process of judging abide in the blessed or baleful conditions and character of personal and social life.

C. A. Beckwith.

Bibliography: For the idea in the Bible the reader will consult works on Biblical theology, such as those by Schultz and Beyschlag (see Biblical Theology); for the theological content, the appropriate sections of treatises on systematic theology such as the works by Hodge, Shedd, and others (see Dogma, Dogmatics); also the literature under Eschatology. Special treatment is given by: J. B. Mozley, *University Sermons*, pp. 72–96, London, 1883; T. T. Munger, *The Freedom of Faith*, pp. 337–356, Edinburgh, 1884; J. M. Whiton, *Beyond the Shadow*, pp. 141–192, ib. 1885; W. N. Clarke, *Outline of Christian Theology*, pp. 459–466, New York, 1898; C. A. Beckwith, *Realities of Christian Theology*, pp. 361–366, Boston, 1906. Consult also A. Jukes, *The Second Death and Restitution of All Things*, London, 1878.

JUDITH. See Apocrypha, A, IV., 8.

Early Life and Work.

JUDSON, ADONIRAM: The Apostle of Burma and one of the first and most devoted of the foreign missionaries of the American churches; b. at Malden, Mass., Aug. 9, 1788; d. on board of a vessel off the coast of Burma Apr. 12, 1850. He graduated first in his class at Brown University in 1807. After teaching school for a year at Plymouth, he entered Andover Seminary in the autumn of 1808, although "not a professor of religion, or a candidate for the ministry, but as a person deeply in earnest on the subject, and desirous of arriving at the truth" (Wayland). The following May he made a profession of his faith in the Third Congregational Church at Plymouth, of which his father was then pastor. His attention was first drawn to the subject of missionary effort in heathen lands by the perusal, in 1809, of Buchanan's *Star in the East;* and in Feb., 1810, he devoted himself to that work. About this time he entered into intimate relations with that illustrious band of young men—Mills, Nott, Newell, and Richards, and joined the first three in submitting a statement to the General Association of Ministers at Bradford, Mass., which led to the organization of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. In Jan., 1811, he was sent to England, by the American Board, to promote measures of affiliation and cooperation between it and the London Missionary Society. He returned unsuccessful in the immediate design of his journey, but was appointed, with Nott, Newell, Hall, and Rice, a missionary to India. He was ordained, with these four men, on Feb. 6, 1812, at Salem, Mass. Judson sailed on the 19th, from New York, with Mrs. Judson and Mr. and Mrs. Newell, for Calcutta, where he arrived June 17. On the voyage his views on the mode of baptism underwent a change; and, after his arrival in India, he and Mrs. Judson were baptized by immersion in the Baptist Church of Calcutta. In consequence of this change of views, he passed under the care of the American Baptist Missionary Union at its formation in 1814. The East India Company forbade his prosecution of missionary labors in India; and, after various vicissitudes, he landed in July, 1813, at Rangoon, Burma, taking up his residence at the Mission House of Felix Carey. Judson devoted himself to the acquisition of the language, in which he afterward became a proficient scholar. After six years of labor, the first convert, Moung Nau, was baptized at Rangoon, June 27, 1819. He was the first Burman accession to the Church of Christ. From 1824 to 1826, during the war of England with Burma, Judson suffered almost incredible hardships. He was imprisoned for seventeen months in the jails of Ava and Oung-pen-la, being bound during nine months of this period, with three, and during two months with no less than five, pairs of fetters. His sufferings from fever, excruciating heat, hunger, repeated disappointments, and the cruelty of his keepers, form one of the most thrilling narratives in the annals of modern missionary trial.

Mrs. Judson.

Mrs. Ann Hasseltine Judson suffered no less than her husband, though she was not subjected to imprisonment. Her heroic efforts to relieve the sufferings of the English prisoners received the tributes of warmest gratitude and praise at the time. She was born in Bradford, Mass., Dec. 22, 1789, and had been married on Feb. 5, 1812. She entered with great enthusiasm into missionary effort, and established a school at Rangoon for girls. In 1821 she paid a visit to America. Her health was never robust; but she combined with strong intellectual powers a remarkable heroism and fortitude. During the imprisonment of her husband she was unremitting in her self-sacrifice, and walked fearless and respected from palace to prison among the excited Burman population. She died Oct. 24, 1826. Hers is one of the immortal names in missionary biography.

In 1826 Judson transferred the headquarters of his mission to Amherst, in Tenasserim, Lower Burma; and in 1830 he began preaching to the Karens. In 1835 he completed the revision of the Old Testament in the Burmese language, and in 1837 that of the New Testament. In the latter year there were 1,144 baptized converts in Burma. After an absence of more than thirty years, he returned, in 1845, for a visit to his native land. On the voyage his second wife (Sarah Hall Boardman) died (Sept. 1) at St. Helena. She was the widow of the missionary, Dr. Boardman, and was married to Judson in 1834. Judson's arrival in the United States was the signal for an enthusiastic outburst of admiration for the missionary, and interest in the cause he represented. Everywhere crowded assemblies gathered to see and hear him. He, however, shunned the public gaze, and was diffident as a speaker. In 1823 Brown University had honored him with the degree of D.D. On July 11, 1846, he again set sail for Burma, having married, a few days before, Miss Emily Chubbuck of Eaton, N. Y., who was already well known under the name of "Fanny Forester." He arrived safely at Rangoon, and spent much of the remaining period of his life in revising his English-Burmese dictionary (ed. E. A. Stevens, Maulmain, 1852). His health, however, was shattered; and he died while on a voyage to the Isle of Bourbon. His body was buried in the ocean.

Later Work. Visit to America.

Judson was a man of medium height and slender person. He was endowed with strong intellectual powers, and sought in his Christian life, by the perusal of the works of Mme. Guyon and others, a fervent type of piety. His confidence in the success of missionary effort never wavered. Being asked, on his visit to America, whether the prospects were bright for the conversion of the world, he immediately replied, "As bright, Sir, as the promises of God." Adoniram Judson's name will always have a place in the very first rank of American missionaries to heathen lands. He belongs to the first band of those missionaries, and his heroism, wise judgment, and diligent labor have not been excelled if equaled by any who have followed him.

D. S. Schaff.

Bibliography: Biographies of Adoniram Judson have been witten by F. Wayland, 2 vols., Boston, 1853; H. Bonar, London, 1871; and E. Judson (his son), New York, 1883. The lives of his three wives were written by W. Wyeth, 3 vols., New York, 1892; A. W. Stuart, Auburn, 1851; A. W. Wilson, New York, 1853; and by C. B. Hartley, ib. n. d.

JUDSON, EDWARD: Baptist; b. at Maulmain (95 m. s.e. of Rangoon), Burma, Dec. 27, 1844. He was brought to the United States while still an infant, and was educated at Madison (now Colgate) University and Brown University (A.B., 1865), after which he was principal of the academy at Townshend, Vt., for two years (1865–67). He was then professor of Latin in Madison University from 1867–74, and, after a year of travel and study in Europe in 1874–75, accepted a call to the pastorate of the Baptist church at Orange, N. J., where he remained until 1881. In the latter year he became pastor of the Berean Baptist Church, New York City, where he engaged actively in educational and philanthropic work among the poorer classes. The church becoming too small for the congregation which he gathered, he raised funds for the erection of the Judson Memorial Church, New York City, which is one of the leading "institutional" churches of the city. He has since been pastor of this church, which is named in honor of his father, Adoniram Judson (q.v.). He was president of the American Baptist Missionary Union in 1885–87 and has been a trustee of Brown University, Vassar College, and Colgate University. He has written: *Life of Adoniram Judson* (New York, 1883); and *The Institutional Church: Primer in Pastoral Theology* (1899).

JUELICHER, yü'liH-er, **GUSTAV ADOLF:** German Protestant; b. at Falkenberg (a suburb of Berlin) Jan. 26, 1857. He was educated at the University of Berlin (Ph.D., 1880), and was chaplain of the orphan asylum at Rummelsberg, a suburb of Berlin, from 1882 to 1888. In 1887 he became privat-docent at the university of the same city for New-Testament history and church history, and in the following year was appointed associate professor of the same subjects at Marburg, where he has been full professor since 1889. He is a member of the committee on Church Fathers of the Royal Prussian Academy of Berlin and in this capacity is engaged in the preparation of a *Prosopographia imperii Romani* from the reign of Diocletian to Justinian. In theology his position is that of a rigid limitation to strict historical investigation. He has written: *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (2 vols., Freiburg, 1888–99), *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (1894; Eng. transl., *Introduction to the New Testament*, London, 1904); and *Paulus und Jesus* (Tübingen, 1907).

JULIAN: The Emperor Julian (Flavius Claudius Julianus), frequently known as "the Apostate," was born at Constantinople in 331, some time after June 26, the son of Julius Constantius, a younger stepbrother of Constantine the Great, by Basilina, his second wife; d. in Persia June 26, 363. Among the authorities for his life and policy, his own works take the first place, although their history is obscure and their text defective. They include eight orations; a long treatise addressed to Themistius and another to the Athenians; the "Symposium"; the "Beard-hater" (Gk. *Misopogon*); more than eighty letters, some decrees, and some fragments contained almost wholly in Cyril's ten books against Julian. In the "Symposium" (also called *Kaisares*) he criticizes his predecessors in the empire, assembled at a feast on Olympus, chastises their vices, and ends with a panegyric of Marcus Aurelius. The "Beard-hater" is a satirical treatise written at Antioch in the beginning of 363, containing a witty characterization of himself and of the Christian population of Antioch. The letters, of which a few are spurious or doubtful, were almost all written during his reign, and are the best source for his philosophic and political standpoint. Unfortunately the work "Against the Christians," with the composition of which he was busy in the last months of his life, is only partially extant.

Authorities for his Life.

Next in importance come the pagan historians, especially Ammianus Marcellinus, Eutropius, and Zosimus. The first-named is the main authority for the external events of Julian's reign; he was a writer of great impartiality, and, like Eutropius, a contemporary if not an eye-witness. Zosimus writes with unconcealed sympathy for the restorer of Hellenism. Aurelius Victor tells little. Among the orators and men of letters, Libanius is the most important; seven of his orations refer directly to Julian and offer valuable material. The statements of Eunapius in his lives of the sophists and of the panegyrist Mamertinus are to be received with caution.

As to the Christian writers, their hatred of the emperor led them sometimes into distortions of fact or malicious lies, or at least made them willing to lend an ear to calumny, except during the short period when Julian's recall of the orthodox bishops won a favorable judgment from some, such as Hilary. The two orations in which Gregory Nazianzen denounced the emperor, his contemporary and acquaintance, form a strong contrast to Eusebius' life of Constantine. Among the historians, even Socrates here lays aside his usual impartiality. Rufinus, as a contemporary, deserves most attention; then follow Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, with some fragments of Philostorgius. Isolated notices occur in most of the Fathers, and there are four poems against Julian by Ephraem Syrus written in 363 and containing legendary material mingled with valuable notes. In spite of their prejudice, the ecclesiastical writers are not to be undervalued, as they complete the material of the pagan historians in some important particulars, and demonstrably rest in not a few places upon documentary evidence. Modern historians have learned only in the last two centuries to take a broad and abstract view of Julian's career, and to see with increasing clearness that his admirable qualities were his own, while his obvious and by no means insignificant defects were the product of his education and environment.

Sketch of His Life.

When the sons of Constantine secured the empire in 337 by the slaughter of their male relations (see CONSTANTINE THE GREAT AND HIS SONS), Julian was spared on account of his tender age, and remained in Constantinople under the charge of his distant kinsman, Bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia, and of the eunuch Mardonius, who was a professing Christian, though his ideals seem to have been Hellenistic. It is possible that he laid the foundation for Julian's later attitude; but he also awakened in him the enthusiasm for what was noble and good that distinguished his manhood. In 342 Eusebius died, and the suspicious Constantius confined Julian and his sickly half-brother Gallus in the fortress of Macellum in Cappadocia for the next six years, surrounded by Christian clerics. The lad read the Bible, copied religious books, built a chapel to St. Mamas, and is said to have officiated as a lector in public worship, which presupposes (unless there was some departure from the ordinary practise) that he had been baptized, as indeed Cyril positively asserts, though neither Julian nor any of his contemporaries speak of his baptism. At any rate, there is no reason to suppose that Julian's religious views were at this time hostile to the Christian Church. About 350 the brothers were allowed to leave Macellum, and Julian, returning to Constantinople, devoted himself to study. The emperor objected, however, to his presence in the capital, and he went to Nicomedia, promising not to attend the lectures which Libanius was then delivering there. But he read them; and here at this time, later in Pergamum, and finally in Ephesus he was introduced by the foremost Hellenistic teachers of the day to the Neoplatonic philosophy and mysticism. In 351 he formally, though unobtrusively, became a convert to paganism. The dreams of poets and the speculations of philosophers were to him the living truth; in Neoplatonism he found the revelation of all the wealth of the highest ideals of antiquity and of Greek civilization. His feelings, principles, and aims were, however, not those of the ancient masters whom he thought to follow, but modern, and such as might nearly all have been justified from the teachings of Christian leaders of his day. The fortunes of his life, his imagination and his education inclined him to Greek mythology and learning, as similar elements had brought thousands of others to Christianity. The great task of reforming Hellenism and abolishing the system of his predecessor seems to have been put before him by his philosophic friends in Nicomedia and Ephesus. Whether he was already longing for the throne is not definitely known, but it is likely that he was; and the teachers, who never lost their hold over him, seem to have exacted promises as to his conduct in the event of his accession. In 354 Constantius put Gallus to death, and kept Julian practically in confinement at Milan for six months. Then he was allowed to return to Bithynia, and in the summer of 355 to go to Athens, where he associated with the most prominent Hellenic leaders and was initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries. In October he was recalled to northern Italy, where the emperor needed an heir-apparent and a leader against the Germanic inroads in Gaul. He played a valiant part for four years of military activity amid great difficulties, carrying the war into the enemy's own country and winning the respect and confidence of the army. He was in Paris in the winter of 359–360. There he received the command to send his best soldiers to the East to Constantius. They answered by hailing Julian as Augustus, apparently without any suggestion from him, if not against his will. After some hesitation he allowed them to crown him, and notified Constantius of what had happened, without assuming the imperial title. Constantius answered with the sword; but Julian was ready to meet him. During the winter of 360–361 he was making his preparations at Vienne. He celebrated the feast of the Epiphany with Christian rites; then he threw off the mask, and went south by forced marches, opening the closed pagan temples wherever he passed. Constantius came from Syria to meet him, but died Nov. 3 in Cilicia; and on Dec. 11, 361, Julian entered Constantinople as undisputed emperor. He remained there the rest of that winter, occupied with plans for far-reaching reforms, but at the same time making preparations for a campaign against the Persians. In the summer of 362 he went through Asia Minor, receiving discouraging reports of the results of his policy, to Antioch, where the excitable and vivacious populace received him with open scorn of his views and plans, and the Christian portion indulged in ominous demonstrations. On Mar. 4, 363, he started out for his campaign, pressing forward boldly to meet his Persian enemies, sharing all the fatigues and privations of his soldiers, and busily occupied at the same time with his studies and his great reform plans. After several successful skirmishes, he received a spear-wound in the battle of June 26, and died a few hours afterward. The famous narrative of Theodoret, according to which he cried out just before he died, "Thou hast conquered, O Galilean!" is apparently an outgrowth of the account written by Ephraem Syrus in the same year, which relates how "he turned aside, groaning, and thought of the threats which at his departure he had made by letter against the Church." It is significant that the Persians, according to Ammianus (XXV., vi. 6), on the following day mocked the Romans as traitors to their own emperor, since it was a Roman spear that had pierced his side. The rumor soon spread in the empire, and Libanius in his funeral oration put into words the suspicion that a Christian had been responsible for his death. Gregory Nazianzen, Rufinus, and Socrates treat the question as indifferent, and Sozomen shows that the Christians were capable of the deed by claiming it for one of them and lauding it. But Libanius did not offer the slightest evidence in support of his accusation, and several considerations may be urged against it. Similar rumors have often arisen in the case of a sudden death; Julian was a bold and reckless soldier, who had often exposed himself to great danger; he himself gave utterance to no suspicion—according to Ammianus he thanked the gods that he had fallen by "no clandestine ambush"; Eutropius says expressly that he was wounded by one of the enemy, and Ephraem knows nothing different; and Ammianus says that no offers of reward produced the Persian who had given the wound—he may have been dead—which gave rise to their reproach of the Romans, and thus to the growth of the legend. Julian was buried at Tarsus, leaving no heir; and his wife, Helena, the sister of Constantius, had died at Vienne in the winter of 360–361.

His Policy and Character.

The restoration of Hellenism was the great aim of Julian's reign. On his arrival in Constantinople he made a clean sweep of the old court, and the Neoplatonic philosophers, with Maximus at their head, hastened to appear there in support of one who was an emperor after their own heart. The worship of the ancient gods in its traditional form was declared the privileged religion; the temples were ordered to be opened or rebuilt, and their property restored. Julian was especially anxious to restore the complete sacrificial system; and the way in which he went to work shows that the ideas underlying the old public worship were not his, but that he designed to bring about the restoration of the old paganism under the forms of certain mystic cults, and to unite all the older religions into a sort of pagan imperial church. It is from the mysteries that all the determining lines of his policy are taken. If the whole of public life was to be ordered according to the piety prescribed in the mysteries, the plan would not have been a reaction but a reform in the highest sense. The return to the ancient gods is the only reactionary feature of it; the ascetic-pietistic and mystic-hierarchical ordering of the worship, with its organized associations and priesthood, would have been an unheard-of innovation. To change paganism into a State religion, and thus to modify the whole relation between religion and the State as it had been understood in antiquity, was a thing which could be done only by force. The remnant of the pagan population showed itself indifferent or actually hostile to the plans which Julian promulgated in a series of edicts which combined, so to speak, imperial and papal characteristics. The reforming tendencies of his plans were displayed especially in his provisions for the ceremonial reception of converts to paganism, who were to be admitted to draw near to the gods only after spiritual and bodily purification, and for the creation of a definitely graduated and strictly organized hierarchy, with the emperor as *pontifex maximus*, and high priests (answering to metropolitans) for the provinces. In yet other particulars the imitation of the Church's discipline is obvious. It is most direct in regard to the care of the poor, as to which Julian made no secret of his admiration for the Christian model; other resemblances are indirect, coming through the influence which the mysteries had already exercised upon the Christian system.

In discussing the question of Julian's actual relations to the Christian Church, it is necessary to distinguish between what was in his mind and what he actually did, and even between the different parts of his short reign—since, though his policy did not essentially change, there are traces of increasing irritation in his mind, which influenced his edicts. In principle, however, he rejected the use of force as an aid to conversion. Christianity, which he regarded as a pitiable superstition of weak-minded people, a distorted form of worship suited to barbarians with no knowledge of history, an assemblage of discordant elements held together only by an ambitious clergy, was to be allowed to fall to decay of itself. In the army the cross was to be replaced by pagan emblems, and the pretorian guard was to be purged of Christians. Christian officials were to be removed from the government. All privileges were withdrawn from the clergy and the Church, including support from State funds and such rights of jurisdiction as had been conceded. The restoration of pagan temples at the cost of those who had destroyed them imposed this burden upon the Christians. All Christian factions were to be treated alike, including the Donatists, and this involved the recall of the banished orthodox bishops. The old idea that he did this with the purpose of fostering discord among his antagonists, while in view of the short-sightedness of his policy it is possible, is not probable; and the result was actually beneficial to the Church. His school law of June 17, 362, which required candidates for teachers' positions to obtain the license of the local authorities or of the emperor, while apparently not affecting religious questions, really excluded the Christians from such positions. The assertion that he forbade them to attend the schools is apparently based on a misunderstanding. Another weapon in his religious campaign was his treatise "Against the Christians," which he circulated not long before his death. The whole first book is extant, some fragments of the second, and scarcely any of the third. For knowledge and acuteness it is not to be compared with the works of Celsus and Porphyry. It tells much of the religious and historical attitude of Julian and his partizans, but little of his relations with the Church, whose real weak points are seldom touched upon. If it were possible positively to decide as to the truth of the statements that he threatened severe repressive measures against his return from the Persian campaign, it would be easier to arrive at a final judgment of the man; but sober history will at least regard him most truly as a belated son of a great bygone age, deceived in his ideals but noble in nature, and deserving of honor as a man who attempted to do justice to his fellows at a time when this was a rare virtue. (A. Harnack.)

Bibliography: The best edition of the works of Julian in the original Greek is by F. C. Hertlein, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1875–76; the fragments of his Books against the Christians were edited by K. J. Neumann (ib. 1880), who also translated them into German, *Kaiser Julians Bücher gegen die Christen*, ib. 1880. In English translation are Gregory Nazianzen's two invectives against, and Libanius' funeral oration upon Julian; and Julian's essays "Upon the Sovereign Sun," and "Upon the Mother of the Gods" (transl. by C. W. King, *Julian the Emperor*, London, 1888). In French there is a complete translation of Julian's works and letters, by Eugène Talbot, *Œuvres complètes de l'empereur Julièn*, Paris, 1863. The most elaborate biography of Julian is by Gætano Negri, transl. from the 2d ed. of the original Italian, 2 vols., London and New York, 1905; other noteworthy biographies are by Neander, Eng. transl., London, 1850; F. J. Holgwarth, Freiburg, 1874; A. Naville, Neuchâtel, 1877; G. H. Rendall, Cambridge, 1877; Alice Gardner, London and New York, 1895; W. Koch, Leipsic, 1899; E. Müller, Hanover, 1901; P. Allard, 3 vols., Paris, 1902. Special treatises are: F. Rode, *Geschichte der Reaction Kaiser Julians gegen die christliche Kirche*, Jena, 1877; E. J. Chinnock, *A Few Notes on Julian and a Translation of his Public Letters*, London, 1901. Consult also Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vi.; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, iii. 398–412; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chaps. xxii.–xxiv.; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 41–59; *DCB*, iii. 484–525.

JULIAN CESARINI, CARDINAL. See Cesarini, Giuliano.

JULIAN OF ECLANUM: The most gifted and consistent champion of Pelagianism; b. in Apulia between 380 and 390; d., according to Gennadius, under Valentinian III. (425–455). Well educated in classical literature, he learned from Aristotle the art of dialectics which he used so cleverly in later times. While still a youth, he became bishop of Eclanum near Beneventum and seems to have been greatly respected. It is not known how he was won over to Pelagianism, but this doctrine corresponded to his whole disposition, which was not religious, but intellectual. By an edict of the Emperor Honorius and the *Epistola tractatoria* of the Roman Bishop Zosimus (see Pelagius), Julian with seventeen other bishops was crowded out of his episcopal position in 418 and expelled from his native country. Entrusted with the defense of his associates, he assumed the leadership in the struggle against Augustinianism, and attacked it first in a letter to Bishop Rufus of Thessalonica, wherein he laid down his views concerning the divine creation of each individual man, concerning marriage, law, the freedom of the will, and baptism against Augustine and his adherents, whom he regarded as Manicheans. In connection with this letter there was issued a circular letter to the adherents of Pelagius in Italy, which, however, was probably not written by Julian himself. Against Augustine's *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* he directed the four books of his work *Ad Turbantium* (419); its main thought is the natural goodness of man vouchsafed by God's creation. Augustine wrote a second treatise *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* and Julian answered by addressing eight books to Florus (*Libri viii ad Florum contra Augustine librum secundum de nuptiis*). This is Julian's most important writing, full of personal, passionate, and spiteful polemics against Augustine, but also fraught with dialectical acuteness and logical sequence of thoughts; it forms the proper source for the knowledge of Julian's theology. The efforts of himself and his associates at the court of the Byzantine Emperor Theodosius II. (d. 450) to be restored to their positions were without success, and Marius Mercator especially caused his expulsion from Constantinople. At the Council of Ephesus in 431 he was expressly condemned.

The fundamental presupposition of Julian's doctrines is that sin is a matter of the will and not of nature. Will again presupposes the freedom of choice, and this consists in the possibility of admitting or rejecting sin. In virtue of this liberty of will man bears the image of God within himself and is akin to him just as according to his sensual nature he is related to the animal. In free will man possesses such a perpetual possibility of willing and not willing that Julian denies even the force of motives. From this conception of free will it follows that it is a possession which can not be lost and can not be restrained or limited by sin. The conception of sin as a work of the will implies that it can arise only under an entirely free choice. Therefore Julian found himself in entire opposition to Augustine's doctrine of hereditary sin. It is a *contradictio in adjecto* since sin and guilt can exist only where there is freedom of decision. Children can not sin because they have no will. It is perfect nonsense to deny the virtue of pagans. Augustine's doctrine is altogether Manichean since only the devil can be the creator and lord of an evil nature. Augustine is even worse than Mani, since he makes God the author and multiplier of sin. Since God creates the nature of each individual man, it must be good. If man were evil by nature he would not be capable of redemption; disgrace of nature would therefore imply the denial of grace. The doctrine of original sin contradicts also the justice of God, since according to it he recompenses and punishes that which is not a matter of liberty and not due to one's own fault. Justice, however, is a generally acknowledged and fundamental law, and a contradiction to this law suffices for the refutation of the doctrine of hereditary sin. Death is not evil; it is natural for a creature to die. The doctrine of hereditary sin destroys also the sanctity of marriage. Marriage is pleasing to God as the sexual impulse is his work. Even Christ possessed concupiscence, and if there was no *naturale peccatum* in him, it is also not in our nature. At the same time Julian does not deny the importance of God's grace. Our bodily and especially our spiritual endowments are works of divine grace. He does not deny the loss of the *meritum innocentiae*. In baptism we receive forgiveness of sin and incitement to good works. Thus the good will of man is aided by God. The increase of divine benefactions is useful and necessary although virtue and sin remain always a matter of free will. Julian always tried to prove his position from Scripture, but he did not consider this his last and highest authority; for him reason was higher than Scripture and tradition. Scripture can never contradict what reason teaches. No one ever understood how to use the art of dialectics more cleverly than Julian, and he tried to decide all questions by logical conclusions. (N. BONWETSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The chief sources are: Notices in Augustine (who had known Julian's parents and took an interest in him), vols. ii. and x. of the Benedictine edition of his works and *MPL*, xxxiii., xliv., xlv.; cf. xlv. 1736 sqq. For further notices: Marius Mercator, *MPL*, xlviii.; Vincent of Lerins; Prosper; and Gennadius. Consult A. Bruckner, *Julian von Eklanum, sein Leben und seine Lehre*, in *TU*, xv. 3, Leipsic, 1897; C. T. G. Schönemann, *Bibliotheca . . . patrum Latinorum*, ii., § 18, ib. 1794 (condensed account, but valuable); W. Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, ii. 643–644, London, 1890; Harnack, *Dogma*, v. 171 sqq., 186 sqq., 203, 235, 236, vi. 303; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, ix. 483–538, consult Index; Neander, *Christian Church*, ii. 650–655 et passim; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 800, 837–838, 937; *DCB*, iii. 469–473; Von Schubert, in *TU*, xxiv. 4 (1903).

JULIAN OF HALICARNASSUS: Bishop of Halicarnassus. Little is known of Julian's life and personality. As bishop of Halicarnassus in Caria, he took part with the later patriarch of Antioch, Severus, (q.v.) in the intrigue which led to the downfall of the Patriarch Macedonius of Constantinople in 511. After his banishment at the beginning of the reign of Justin I. in 518 (see MONOPHYSITES), he took up his abode in the cloister of Enaton, before the gates of Alexandria. Here he became involved with Severus, likewise in exile, in a dispute over the question whether Christ's body during his life on earth was incorruptible or corruptible (see below). At Alexandria the dispute led to a division of the Monophysite party which continued till the seventh century. Julian's later destinies are unknown; at all events, he did not return to Halicarnassus. His doctrine circulated as far as Arabia, and also found acceptance in the Armenian Church.

There are extant the following works of Julian: his correspondence with Severus, in the Syriac translation of Bishop Paul of Callinicus; ten anathemas; and a commentary on Job printed among Origen's works, and only lately recognized by Usener as a work of Julian's.

The expressions " incorruptible," " corruptible," or " imperishable," " perishable," do not correctly reproduce the debated meaning of *aphthartos*, *phthartos*, as understood by Julian and Severus. The controversy hinges not upon *phthora*, as indicating total dissolution of the body into so many atoms, but on the *phthora* existing in the natural infirmities of the body; such as hunger, thirst, weariness, sweat, tears, bleeding, etc. So, as Julian conceived it, the body of Christ was not subject to this manner of " corruption," which is a characteristic of human nature in consequence of Adam's sin. When Christ hungered and thirsted, he did so because he willed it, not of necessity; and he willed so, because only in that way could he free us from corruption. But Julian did not admit that, in order to redeem us, Christ must have possessed a body subjected to corruption throughout. He could not believe that one and the same being was both " corruptible " and " incorruptible." With singular inconsistency, however, he did not believe himself compelled to deny the doctrine of the like nature of Christ's body to that of ours; on the contrary, he expressly rejected the opposite doctrine, that of Eutyches. The Julian party reproached their opponents for being " corruption worshipers "; whereas these retorted with the reproach of docetism, insomuch that the epithets " aphthartodocetics " and " phantasiasts," or illusionists, ever afterward stayed attached to the Julianists. In this matter, the orthodox and the Severians made common cause, although there were some " aphthartodocetics " among the orthodox themselves. For the fact that Emperor Justinian himself was open to this line of argument see JUSTINIAN; and for the significance of the controverted question generally, as a phase of Monophysitism, see MONOPHYSITES. G. KRÜGER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien*, viii. 550 sqq., 886 sqq., Leipsic, 1778; J. C. L. Gieseler, *Commentatio, qua Monophysitarum . . . variae de Christi persona opiniones . . . illustrantur*, 2 parts, Göttingen, 1835; J. P. N. Land, *Anecdota Syriaca*, iii. 263–271, Leyden, 1870; H. Usener, in H. Lietzmann, *Catenen*, pp. 28–34, Freiburg, 1897; idem, in *Rheinisches Museum*, lv (1900), 321–340; E. Ter-Minassiantz, in *TU*, xxvi. 4 (1904), passim; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 52–53; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, viii. 364, xi. 109, 344; *DCB*, iii. 475–476.

JULIAN OF TOLEDO. See POMERIUS, JULIANUS.

JULIUS: The name of three popes.

Julius I: Pope 337–352. According to tradition he was the son of Rusticus, a Roman, and elected after a long interregnum Feb. 6, 337. Little is known of his pontificate, except in regard to his spiritual care for the rapidly growing Roman community—he built no less than five new churches—and to his position in the Arian controversy, which had scarcely affected Rome before his time. He took part in it only when both parties sought a decision from him. The request came first from the Eusebians, who sent three Eastern clerics in 338 to ask his approval of their deposition of Athanasius and putting Pistus in his place. Soon afterward an embassy appeared from Athanasius, who so successfully presented their case that the Eusebians themselves, so Athanasius asserts, proposed the reference of the matter to a new council. Presently, however, the Eusebians got the ear of the Emperor Constantius, and by Easter, 339, Athanasius himself was seeking refuge in Rome, to be followed by other banished orthodox prelates. The friendly reception which they received in Rome gave the Eusebians an excuse for rudely refusing Julius' invitation to the proposed council. It met at Rome in 340, and absolved Athanasius and Marcellus of Ancyra from the charges brought against them. Julius communicated the result to the Orientals in his famous epistle to Flacillus, a masterpiece of diplomacy. He considers the question from the standpoint of ecclesiastical law, asserting that the Council of Nicæa had permitted the revision of the acts of one synod by another, though no foundation is known for this statement, and justifies his reopening of the case of Athanasius by the assertion that the custom of the Church requires the bishop of Rome to be notified of charges against bishops (or against the bishop of Alexandria) and to lay down the law. This does not apparently cover the later claim to a supreme judicial function; and it did not even attain the result which Julius hoped. The relations between Rome and the East were more strained than ever, and it was not Julius but Hosius of Cordova that determined Constans to summon the Council of Sardica in 343. This council recognized the pope as the strongest support of the Nicene party, and passed canons which really allowed him a more limited authority than the Council of Chalcedon gave in similar cases to the exarchs and the patriarchs of Constantinople, although their importance lies in the use which later popes made of them, interpolating them among those of Nicæa and deducing from them a final judicial authority over the whole Church. Julius seems to have had no opportunity to act on these provisions, since the change in the emperor's attitude toward the Nicene party left him no longer the central figure in the strife. He welcomed Athanasius in Rome on his homeward journey in 346, and shortly after, at the request of a synod in Milan, he investigated the orthodoxy of Ursacius and Valens, and received them both again into communion. He died Apr. 12, 352, and was early honored in Rome as a saint, while the number of forgeries passing under his name shows the impression which his clever policy made on succeeding generations and the extent to which it was held to have strengthened the papal authority.

(H. BÖHMER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 205, Paris, 1886, ed. Mommsen in *MGH*, *Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 75–76; *Catalogus Liberianus*, ed. Mommsen in *MGH*, *Auct. ant.*, ix (1892), 76; *Epist.* in *MPL*, viii. Consult: B. Jungmann, *Dissertationes selectae*, ii. 7–31, Regensburg, 1881; L. Rivington, *Primitive Church and the See of St. Peter*, pp. 173 sqq., 467 sqq., London, 1894; W. Bright, *Roman See and the Early Church*, pp. 81 sqq., ib. 1896; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 100–101; Bower, *Popes*, i. 54–59; *KL*, vi. 1997–98.

Julius II. (Giuliano Rovere—he was not connected with the highly aristocratic Della Rovere family): Pope 1503–13. He was born at Albizzola, near Savona (25 m. s.w. of Genoa), 1443. When his uncle, Francesco (later Pope Sixtus IV.), became cardinal, he turned to the spiritual career, likewise becoming cardinal by 1471; and in 1480–1481, he was legate to the French King Louis XI. He exerted only a moderate influence over his uncle, Sixtus IV. (d. 1484), who stood under the sway of another nephew, Cardinal Riario; but he determined the policy of his successor, Innocent VIII. (q.v.). However, when Borgia (Alexander VI.) ascended the papal throne, Julius was compelled to secure his life by flight to France (1494). It was not until 1498, when the growing power of the pope drew the second successor of Louis XI. to his side, that Julius became ostensibly reconciled with Alexander, and now wrought for the conclusion of a compact between the two rulers which occasioned fresh war over Italy. He did not venture back to Rome till after the death of Alexander VI. (Aug. 18, 1503). On Oct. 31, 1503, after the sudden end of the pontificate of Pius III., lasting less than a month, he was chosen pope. He had gained the Spanish cardinals by the degrading promise not to contest the Romagna against Borgia's son Cesare. Nevertheless, in the first year of his pontificate, he demanded the delivery of the fortresses in that region and made Cesare captive. Then the Venetians interposed, and occupied the Romagna; but, owing to a league of the pope with France and Germany in 1504, they were compelled to surrender all the occupied points except Rimini and Faenza. Julius then at the head of an army wrested these cities from the Venetians and united the entire district with the Papal States. The enmity toward Venice continued, and in 1508 Julius again contrived, in the League of Cambrai, to combine the mightiest sovereigns of the West—Spain, France, and Germany—against the republic. The Curia now began a system of deceitful and opportunist seesaw statecraft whereby it maintained its position among the nations. Hardly were the districts that had been occupied by Venice won back by the help of France, when Julius arrayed himself against France on the side of Venice. The French king's resentment went so far that in 1510 he assembled a national synod against the pope at Tours, and sought an alliance with Emperor Maximilian, with a view to depose the pope from his dignity. Maximilian actually thought of crowning his own head with the tiara. Meanwhile, Julius in person waged war on the duke of Ferrara, who had remained on the side of France, hoping to unite his city and territory with the States of the Church; and he succeeded, in the winter of 1511; but France retaliated by occupying Bologna, and an antipapal council was convened at Pisa. In opposition, Julius convened the Fifth Lateran Council in 1512, and, by founding the "Holy League," he secured the retreat of the French across the Alps in the same year. He still managed to add Parma and Piacenza to the States of the Church; but all the results of his war-lust and of his statecraft continued insecure, since the States of the Church, being subject to a policy of constant vacillation, lacked the conditions of independent existence. He died Feb. 21, 1513.

K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For sources consult his bulls in A. M. Cherubini, *Magnum bullarium Romanum*, i. 477 sqq., Lyons, 1655, and in Turin ed., v. 399 sqq.; R. Brown, *Calendar of State Papers*, vols. i.–ii., London, 1864 sqq.; *Pauli Jovii Historia sui temporis*, Basel, 1517; O. Raynaldus, *Annales ecclesiastici*, Cologne, 1694–1727. Consult further: A. von Reumont, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, iii. 10 sqq., Berlin, 1870; G. Balbi, *Julius II.*, Berlin, 1877; J. Burckhardt, *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien*, i. 112, 231 sqq., Leipsic, 1877; idem, *Geschichte der Renaissance in Italien*, pp. 11 sqq., ib. 1877; M. Brosch, *Papst Julius II. und die Gründung des Kirchenstaates*, Gotha, 1878; F. Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, vol. viii., Stuttgart, 1881; Creighton, *Papacy*, v. 68–202; Ranke, *Popes*, i. 39 sqq., iii. 11–14; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 283–290; *KL*, vi. 1998–2002.

Julius III. (Giovanni Maria del Monte): Pope 1550–55. He was born of a distinguished Roman family, being nephew of Cardinal Antonio del Monte, in Rome in 1487. By favor of Julius II. he succeeded his uncle as archbishop of Siponto, and in 1536 became cardinal under Paul III. As papal legate at the opening of the Council of Trent in 1545, he managed to thwart all the plans of the emperor. In spite of the opposition of the cardinals with imperial sympathies, he was elected pope after the death of Paul III. in 1550. Henceforth he thoroughly reversed his policy toward the emperor, inviting him to reopen the council after its suspension, and turned away from Henry II. of France, whereupon the latter sided with the Farnese nephews and tried to constitute them proprietors of the contested possessions in southern Italy which heretofore they had held from the Church as retainers. The pope was again obliged to suspend the council when Maurice of Saxony, in 1552, turned unexpectedly against the emperor, and almost captured him at Innsbruck. The most momentous event during the pontificate of Julius III. was the death of Edward VI. of England, and the return of England to the Roman obedience. Julius despatched Cardinal Pole (see Pole, Reginald) as plenipotentiary legate to Queen Mary Tudor, and he brought it to pass that Parliament again recognized the papal supremacy, though subject to acceptance of the consummated transfer of church property to state or private possession. He then achieved the bloody realization of the Counter-Reformation in England. The pontificate of Julius III. occurred at a time when in Italy, too, the nullification of the reforming movement was prosecuted with every instrument of force and cunning. He assured free play and advancement to the Inquisition, even though his indolent nature did not so energetically and personally interest him in this matter as proved true of his successors. That his moral life before and after his elevation to the papal throne bears no strict scrutiny, is attested by the utterances of many contemporaries. The avowed favorite Innocent, originally a street urchin of Parma, was not the only unworthy recipient on whom he bestowed church dignities and goods. He likewise endowed his relatives in this way; but the full time of political nepotism was past. Julius died May 23, 1555, shortly after sending Cardinal Morone to Germany, with the purpose of giving such a turn to the religious peace at the impending Diet of Augsburg, that Germany should be led back to the bosom of the Roman Church after the precedent of England. The same aim was to be promoted also by the Collegium Germanicum in Rome, founded by Ignatius Loyola, and formally opened in 1552, where the élite of the Jesuit order were to be educated for the battle against German Protestantism. K. Benrath.

Bibliography: The bulls of Julius are in A. M. Cherubini, *Magnum bullarium Romanum*, i. 778 sqq., Turin ed., vi. 401 sqq. Consult: *Des faitz et gestes du pape Jules III*, Geneva (?), 1551; O. Raynaldus, *Annales ecclesiastici*, Cologne, 1694–1727; Paolo Sarpi, *The Historie of the Councell of Trent*, pp. 298–303, 371, 376, 382–389, London, 1629; C. Weiss, *Papiers de l'état du cardinal de Granvelle*, vol. iii., Paris, 1841; W. G. Soldan, *Geschichte des Protestantismus in Frankreich*, i. 226 sqq., Leipsic, 1855; Petrucelli della Gattina, *Hist. diplomatique des conclaves*, ii. 23 sqq., Paris, 1864; A. von Reumont, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, iii. 2, pp. 503 sqq., Berlin, 1870; L. Maynier, *Étude historique sur le concile de Trente*, pp. 586 sqq., Paris, 1874; M. Brosch, *Geschichte des Kirchenstaats*, i. 189 sqq., Gotha, 1880; De Leva, in *Rivista storica Italiana*, 1884, pp. 632 sqq.; Ranke, *Popes*, i. 206–210 et passim; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 317; *KL*, vi. 2002–05; and literature under Trent, Council of.

JULIUS AFRICANUS, SEXTUS: One of the most learned ecclesiastical writers of the third century; b. probably about 160 in Africa, perhaps in Libya; d. probably soon after 240. In early life he may have been an officer, but after the expedition of Septimius Severus against Osrhoene (195) he settled at Emmaus (Nicopolis) in Palestine. About 215 he spent some time in Alexandria studying under Heraclas, and later, in the reign of Elágabalus or Alexander Severus, went to Rome on behalf of his fellow citizens. He published his "Chronography" in the fourth year of Elágabalus, and his heterogeneous work entitled *Kestoi* ("Embroiderings") under Alexander, to whom it was dedicated. His extant letter to Origen, whom he calls "son," was written in his old age. That he was ordained in later life is doubtful. He is one of the few ancient Greek Fathers who were in relation with Rome, and this was an advantage to his "Chronography." Divided into five books, and beginning with an apologetic purpose, it develops a scientific aim and shows a good knowledge of earlier pagan and Jewish sources. The whole work was practically incorporated into the chronographies of later writers, especially Eusebius, and deserves to be considered not only as the basis of Christian chronography, but as relatively better executed than the attempts of Julius' successors. Critical study of the *Kestoi* has made so little progress that it is scarcely worth while to summarize its conclusions. It appears to have been intended as a sort of encyclopedia of the material sciences with the cognate mathematical and technical branches, but to have contained a large proportion of merely curious, trifling, or miraculous matters, on which account the authorship of Julius has been questioned. Among the parts published are sections on agriculture, liturgiology, tactics, and medicine (including veterinary practise). The two letters, that to Aristides on the genealogies of Christ, of which only fragments are preserved, and that to Origen on the story of Susanna, are admirable bits of critical historical work. (A. Harnack.)

Bibliography: Incomplete collections of the fragments are in A. Gallandi, *Bibliotheca veterum patrum*, ii. 337–376, 14 vols., Venice, 1765–81, and in M. J. Routh, *Reliquiae sacrae*, vol. ii., 5 vols., Oxford, 1846–48. The best ed. of the "Chronography" is in Gelzer, see below; for the

Kestoi consult *Veterum mathematicorum opera*, ed. M. Thevenot and J. Boivin, Paris, 1693; and for the Letter to Aristides, F. Spitta, *Der Brief des Julius Africanus an Aristides*, Halle, 1877. An Eng. transl. of the fragments is in *ANF*, vi. 123 sqq.; and a list of literature is given in *ANF*, Bibliography, pp. 68–69. Consult: Jerome, *De vir. ill.*, lxiii.; H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1880–98; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 803–805; Krüger, *History*, pp. 248–253; Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 507–513, ii. 1, pp. 124 sqq., ii. part ii., passim; *DCB*, i. 53–57.

Early Activity.

JULIUS ECHTER: Bishop of Würzburg 1573–1617; b. at the castle of Mespelbrunn in the Spessart (northwestern Bavaria) Mar. 18, 1545; d. at Würzburg Sept. 13, 1617. The circumstances under which his work was begun were as follows: Not till after 1540, after the death of Bishop Conrad II., did the Reformation prosper in the diocese of Würzburg. Then almost all citizens and noblemen separated from the old church and inaugurated Lutheran preachers. Roman Catholic institutions decayed and the secular clergy was without means and protection, so that many of its members adopted the new doctrine. Bishop Friedrich of Wirsberg (1558–73) did not possess the necessary energy to stem the tide of the new movement, although he sought a very close political union with Bavaria and in 1567, against the opposition of the cathedral chapter, realized the foundation of a Jesuit college in Würzburg. On Dec. 1, 1573, Julius Echter was elected bishop. He had been educated in the Roman Catholic spirit from 1560 to 1569 at Mainz, Louvain, Douai, Paris, Angers, Pavia and Rome. As a licentiate of law and with a fund of knowledge often praised in later times he came in 1569 to Würzburg where he was received as an active member of the cathedral chapter. In 1570 he became dean of the cathedral and in his twenty-eighth year was elected bishop, to the great satisfaction of Rome. In spite of contrary statements, it has been proved that he never had Protestant inclinations. He represented the interests of the Roman Catholic estates of the realm at the diet of Regensburg in 1576 and of Augsburg in 1582. Continuing the policy of his predecessor, he kept in the closest touch with Bavaria. He was thought to be secretly inclined toward Protestantism because of his cooperation in the deposition of Balthasar of Dernbach, abbot of Fulda, in 1576 at Hammelburg, but this action was due to a youthful ambition to incorporate the abbacy of Fulda and to become the successor of Balthasar. His act caused general indignation among Roman Catholics, and the abbot was reinstituted in 1602.

His Timidity.

It was only with great hesitancy that Julius undertook the work of counteracting the Reformation in his diocese. Although he had been urged by Rome in 1575 and 1577, he did not convoke a diocesan synod because he dreaded the hatred of the Protestant princes. Moreover, he feared to proceed against heretical ecclesiastics lest whole regions should be deprived of ecclesiastics for whom there were no substitutes. From the noble families he did not dare to demand the oath of adherence to the Roman confession of faith because he suspected that none of them had remained faithful. In 1582 he still asked for a papal brief that should censure him on account of the conditions in his diocese and impose upon him a visitation and examination of all ecclesiastics, and a second similar brief to be directed to the chapter. The Curia granted both of them. His implication in the affair of Fulda also hampered his attempts against the Reformation, but, on the other hand, it required him to give clear proof of his fidelity to Roman Catholicism. But the weakness of the Protestant princes became so evident at the diets of 1576 and 1582 and on other occasions that Julius lost his fear.

His Achievements in Counter-Reform.

Nevertheless, even in the early years of his administration he had made some important changes. In 1575 all concubines, even those of the canons, were forced to leave the city of Würzburg; in 1577 fourteen preachers were expelled from the chapter; in 1581 Julius rejected the interference of the nobility with religious affairs. In 1578 the seminary of priests was newly organized, and in 1582 there was established again the University of Würzburg as an institution of the Counter-Reformation, under the dominating influence of the Jesuits. A new church order (1584 in Latin, 1589 in a remodeled form in German) impressively reminded the clergy of their duties in the spirit of the Council of Trent and enforced a stricter ecclesiastical organization. All Lutheran preachers (about 170) were deprived of their offices; Protestant officers were dismissed. A visitation of the whole diocese (1585 to 1587) was directed against all Protestant members of the population. In 1587 all who did not become Catholic were compelled to emigrate; in the course of three years about 100,000 had been converted. Only a few hundred remained true to their convictions and preferred to emigrate in spite of the fact that they had to leave one-third of their possessions to the bishop. Julius preserved an attitude of calm amid the resentment of the Protestants. Pamphlets were published against him, and the electors of Saxony, Palatinate and Brandenburg, the landgrave of Hesse, the margraves of Brandenburg and Baden, the prince of Anhalt protested, some addressing themselves to the emperor with complaints about the violation of the religious peace; but Julius no longer overestimated the importance of these Protestant admonitions, feeling himself secure under the protection of Duke Wilhelm of Bavaria and of the pope and assured of the favor of the emperor. The reform of ecclesiastical institutions went hand in hand with the suppression of Protestantism. The new church order contained, beside regulations for the conduct of the clergy, instructions concerning the church service, claimed possession of the churches, and ordered observance of the decrees of councils. There appeared revised editions of books for the church service, of breviaries, psalters, and missals. The book-trade was so controlled that only unobjectionable books were circulated. The monasteries, too, felt the reforming influence of the bishop—the possessions of those that were hopelessly ruined were used for other purposes (university, hospital), the others were restored and subjected to rigorous visitations;

in the same way the chapter was reformed. A few of the nobility opposed the new state of affairs, and remnants of the Reformation were still found at the beginning of the nineteenth century; but on the whole Würzburg had become thoroughly Catholic, and the generation following that of Julius was devoted to the church and the Jesuits. See BALTHAZAR OF DERNBACH AND THE COUNTER-REFORMATION IN FULDA. (W. GOETZ.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. N. Buchinger, *Julius Echter von Mespelbrunn*, Würzburg, 1843; H. L. J. Heppe, *Restauration des Katholicismus in . . . Würzburg*, Marburg, 1850; F. X. Wegele, *Geschichte der Universität Würzburg*, 2 vols., Würzburg, 1882; Lossen, in *Forschungen der deutschen Geschichte*, vol. xxiii.; M. Ritter, *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation*, i. 624 sqq., Stuttgart, 1887; J. Janssen, *Hist. of the German People*, viii. 335, 366, London, 1905; *KL*, vi. 2009–16.

JUMPERS: A name applied in derision to the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists (see PRESBYTERIANS) since they not only expressed their emotion in the outcries frequent in Methodist meetings, but also "leaped and sprang for joy." These ecstatic manifestations first appeared about 1760 in circles of Welsh Methodists, and spread with such contagion that they were for a time regarded as a characteristic of the sect. Justification for the practise was sought from I Sam. vi. 16; Luke vi. 23; and Acts iii. 8. The custom later became obsolete. (C. SCHOELL†.)

JUNCKER, yunk′er, **ALFRED:** German Protestant; b. at Ida- und Marienhütte, Silesia, July 4, 1865. He was educated at the universities of Breslau, Berlin, Leipsic, and Halle from 1884 to 1888 (lic. theol., Halle, 1891). From 1892 to 1895 he was pastor at Bunzlau, after which he was appointed inspector of the Sedlnitzkysches Johanneum, Breslau. In 1896 he became privat-docent at the University of Breslau, where he was appointed to his present position of associate professor of New-Testament exegesis in 1904. He has written *Das Ich und die Motivation des Willens im Christentum, ein Beitrag zur Lösung des eudämonistischen Problems* (Halle, 1891); *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, vol. i. (Halle, 1904); and *Das Gebet bei Paulus* (Gross-Lichterfelde, 1905).

JUNILIUS: Ecclesiastical writer; b. in Africa; d. about 550. He was a contemporary of Cassiodorus and lived at Constantinople under Justinian, where he held some high civil office (according to Procopius, *Historia arcana*, xx., that of Quaestor sacri palatii). According to his own statement, his work entitled: *Instituta regularia divinæ legis*, which he dedicated to Bishop Primasius of Hadrumetum at the time of the Three Chapter Controversy (q.v.), is based on the communications of a Persian Paulus. In the form of question and answer, this work, in two books, contains a methodical introduction into the sacred Scriptures. The first part (book i. 1–10) treats of the various rhetorical styles, of the varied authority and authorship of the Scriptures, distinction between poetry and prose, of the proper sequence between the two Testaments. The books of Chronicles, Job, Ezra with Nehemiah and Esther, and also Canticles, James, II Peter, Jude, II and III John, and Revelation are not reckoned among the canonical Scriptures. The second part (book i. 11–ii. 27) presents a synopsis of the doctrinal content of Scripture: of God, his being, the persons of the Trinity, God's modes of operation, and his relation to his creatures; of the present world, creation, divine government, nature, free will; and of the world to come, the story of salvation, election and calling; of types and prophecies, and their fulfilment both in time and in eternity. In conclusion, there are some hermeneutical rules (ii. 28), grounds for the credibility of Scripture (ii. 29), and an explanation of the relation between reason and faith. G. KRÜGER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The work of Junilius was edited by J. Gast, Basel, 1545, reproduced Paris, 1644, and reprinted in *MPL*, lxviii. 15–42; also by H. Kihn, Freiburg, 1880, and in pp. 465–528 of Kihn's *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus*, ib. 1880. Consult: A. Rahlfs, in *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften . . . zu Göttingen*, 1890, pp. 242–246; *DCB*, iii. 534–535.

JUNIUS, FRANCISCUS (FRANÇOIS DU JON): Reformed theologian; b. at Bourges May 1, 1545; d. at Leyden Oct. 13, 1602. At the age of thirteen he began the study of law, but soon gave it up in order to repair the deficiencies of his earlier education at the school of Lyons, where he succumbed for a time to the temptations of atheism, but soon was converted and then studied theology at Geneva. In 1565 he was called as preacher to the Walloon congregation of Antwerp, whence he had to flee in 1567, owing to intrigues of Roman Catholic and Anabaptist opponents. He accompanied Prince William of Orange on his campaign to Champagne, then he became pastor of the Walloon congregation at Schönau in the Palatinate. In 1573 Elector Frederick III. called him to Heidelberg to assist in a Latin translation of the Old Testament. After the death of the elector, Count Palatine John Casimir called him to the newly established Casimirianum at Neustadt-on-the-Haardt. Soon afterward he became preacher of the Walloon congregation in Otterberg. In 1582 he returned to his professorship at Neustadt and in 1584 removed to the University of Heidelberg. In 1592 he followed a call to Leyden. In his theological convictions he was always a genuine pupil of Calvin. His *Ecclesiastici sive de natura et administratione ecclesiae Dei libri tres* (Heidelberg, 1581) had great influence upon the development of synods and presbyteries. His *Parallela sacra* (1588), a treatise on Old-Testament quotations in the New, was epoch-making for Biblical exegesis. In his *Animadversiones* (1602), against Bellarmine, he defended Protestantism against Romanism, and in *Defensio catholicae doctrinae* (1592) he attacked the Antitrinitarians. *Le Plaisible Chrestien ou de la paix de l'église catholique*, written a few months before the renunciation of Protestantism by Henry IV., is a defense of an independent Gallico-Catholic Church. He also made several translations, and wrote works of philological and historical interest. His contemporaries esteemed him very highly. (F. W. CUNO†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The early *Vita* by P. Merula appeared Leyden, 1595, and Esslingen, 1769, also reprinted in the *Opera* of Junius, Geneva, 1607, 1613. The best modern

life is by F. W. Cuno, Amsterdam, 1891; others are by J. Reitsma, Groningen, 1864, and A. Davaine, Paris, 1882. Consult also Niceron, *Mémoires*, vol. xvi.; P. Bayle, *Dictionary Historical and Critical*, iii. 623–628, London, 1736.

JUNKIN, jūn′kin, **GEORGE:** Presbyterian; b. near Carlisle, Pa., Nov. 1, 1790; d. in Philadelphia May 20, 1868. He was graduated at Jefferson College, Pa., in 1813, studied theology under John M. Mason in New York, and in 1819 became pastor of the Associate Reformed Church at Milton, Penn. In 1822 he went over to the Presbyterian Church. He was principal of the Pennsylvania Manual Labor Academy, Germantown, Pa., 1830–1832, president of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., 1832–41 and again 1844–48, and president of Miami University, Ohio, 1841–44. In 1848 he became president of Washington College (now Washington and Lee University), Lexington, Va. On the secession of Virginia in 1861, which he had strongly opposed, he removed to Philadelphia. He was one of the leaders of the Old School Presbyterians, and was moderator of the General Assembly in 1844. The more important of his publications are: *The Vindication: A Reply to the Defence of Robert Barnes* (Philadelphia, 1836); *A Treatise on Justification* (1839); *Lectures on the Prophecies* (1844); *Political Fallacies* (New York, 1863); *A Treatise on Sanctification* (Philadelphia, 1864); *The Two Missions, the Apostolical and the Evangelical* (1864); *The Tabernacle* (1865); and *A Commentary upon the Epistle to the Hebrews* (1873).

Bibliography: His *Life* was written by his brother, D. X. Junkin, Philadelphia, 1871. Consult: E. H. Gillett, *History of the Presbyterian Church*, ii. 473–475 et passim, Philadelphia, 1864; R. E. Thompson, *American Church History Series*, vi. 109–111 et passim, New York, 1895; J. H. Patton, *Popular Hist. of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.*, pp. 402–404, 422, ib. 1900.

JURIEU, zhü″rî-ū′, **PIERRE:** With the possible exception of Pierre Bayle (q.v.), the most important theologian and strongest controversialist of the French Calvinists at the close of the seventeenth century; b. at Mer (11 m. n.e. of Blois), where his father was pastor, Dec. 24, 1637; d. at Rotterdam Jan. 11, 1713. He studied philosophy at the Academy of Saumur and divinity at Sedan 1656–58, then traveled through the Netherlands and England. In 1671 he succeeded to his father's curacy at Mer, was ordained, and remained there till 1674, when the Academy of Sedan elected him lecturer in Hebrew and soon after preacher. He filled both offices with such ability that Bayle, who had obtained through him a lectureship in philosophy in 1675, designated him " one of the first men of this century, the first of our communion." During the ten years spent at Sedan, Jurieu zealously defended the Reformation against the attacks of Bossuet and others. In July, 1681, when the Academy of Sedan was dissolved by Louis XIV., as his stay in France had become dangerous, he went to Rotterdam, where, besides a pastorship, he received a lectureship founded specially for him. There he worked hard to promote the cause of the French Reformed Church by his writings, and caring for the exiled French pastors. Like Comenius and others he had to pass through sad experiences, having become too sanguine of the immediate restoration of the French Church through his interpretation of the prophecies in the Apocalypse, and later on by expecting too much from the fanatical prophets of Dauphiné. Meanwhile advancing age warned him to bring to completion a work on which he had long been busy, his *Histoire critique des dogmes et des cultes*, published in two parts at Amsterdam, 1704–05 (Eng. transl., 2 vols., London, 1705). Thenceforth ill health kept him from work.

Jurieu, like Calvin, held that the true Church is known by two signs: the preaching of the pure word of God and the right dispensation of the sacraments. It should be governed by the representatives of the Christian congregation, and has the right to exclude all those who do not accept the confession of faith. However, later on, to refute Bossuet and to satisfy new conceptions of his own mind, he came to a broader view of the Church. In his *Histoire du calvinisme et du papisme* (2 vols., Rotterdam, 1683) he makes a distinction between the temporal and the spiritual power. In the name of the latter, he demands full liberty of conscience. But the church service must be approved by the majority of the nation because the sovereign is only the representative of the nation. When, in 1685, the Edict of Nantes was revoked by Louis XIV., many Protestants besides Jurieu began to doubt the divine right of kings and stood for the rights of the people. As in Bayle's writings many of Voltaire's ideas are to be found, so in Jurieu's works is the germ of Rousseau's *Contrat social.*

Since many of the controversial works of the time were published anonymously, it is not always possible to determine their authorship with certainty. The principal works undoubtedly by Jurieu are: on dogma and controversy, against the Roman Catholics, *La Politique du clergé de France* (Amsterdam, 1680); *Réflexions sur la cruelle persécution que souffre l'église réformée en France* (1685); *Préjugés légitimes contre le papisme* (1685); *Le Vrai Système de l'église et la véritable analyse de la foi* (Dort, 1686); *Lettres pastorales addressées aux fidèles de France* (Rotterdam, 1686; Eng. transl., London, 1689); concerning the Lutherans or the Reformed, *Des droits des deux souverains en matière de religion* (1687); *Unité de l'église et points fondamentaux* (1688); on history and politics, *Histoire du calvinisme et du papisme unis en parallèle* (2 vols., 1683); edifying and apocalyptic, *L'Accomplissement des prophéties ou la délivrance de l'église* (2 vols., 1686; Eng. transl., London, 1687); *Traité de l'amour divin* (1700). G. Bonet-Maury.

Bibliography: The biographies by C. van Oordt, Geneva, 1879 (best); and C. E. Mégnin, Strasburg, 1854. Consult also: J. C. F. Hoefer, *Nouvelle biographie générale*, xxvii. 267 sqq., 46 vols., Paris, 1852–66; F. Puaux, *Les Précurseurs français de la tolérance*, Dôle, 1880; J. B. Kan, in *Bulletin de la commission de l'histoire des églises Wallones*, Paris, 1890; H. M. Baird, *Huguenots and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes*, 2 vols., New York, 1895; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, vi. 551–559.

JURISDICTION, ECCLESIASTICAL.

I. The Early and Roman Catholic Churches.
1. Penal and Disciplinary Jurisdiction.
  The First Three Centuries (§ 1).
  The Christian Roman Empire (§ 2).
  The Merovingian Period (§ 3).
  The Carolingian and Later Periods (§ 4).
  Deposition, Degradation, and Suspension (§ 5).
  Matters Calling for Penalty (§ 6).
  The Organ of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction (§ 7).
  Competence of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction (§ 8).
  Secular Jurisdiction over the Clergy (§ 9).
  Method of Procedure (§ 10).
2. Administrative and Civil Jurisdiction.
II. The Protestant Churches.
  Modern Trend (§ 1).
  Fundamental Law in the United States (§ 2).
  Elementary Principles (§ 3).
  Limits of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction (§ 4).
  Legal Aspects of Discipline (§ 5).
  Relations of Churches and Officers (§ 6).

1. The First Three Centuries.

I. The Early and Roman Catholic Churches.— 1. Penal and Disciplinary Jurisdiction: In the apostolic period, the Church exercised such disciplinary jurisdiction as any organization naturally has over its members, expressed in the case of grave faults by exclusion from the Church, with a possibility of restoration to membership on proof of repentance and amendment (I Cor. v. 11; II Cor. ii. 5 sqq.). In the subapostolic era this exclusion is not only from the local community but from the whole Church; and the bishop, who now, with the other clergy and the whole body of believers, exercises this jurisdiction, appears as a divinely appointed organ of it, acting in the place of Christ. With the second century appears a stricter principle, denying the possibility of more than one restoration to communion, and of even one in the case of such grievous sins as idolatry, unchastity, and murder. Where restoration was allowed, it followed upon public Penance (q.v.); but this was of the nature of a preliminary voluntarily assumed, not of a penal measure. In the third century deposition and deprivation of income are employed against clerics, in addition to excommunication.

2. The Christian Roman Empire.

With the recognition of Christianity by the State and the increasing conciliar activity, the system developed in more detail. Against laymen different forms of Excommunication (q.v.) were employed; against clerics, deposition, degradation, or suspension, sometimes with deprivation of clerical income or (in the case of young clerics and those in minor orders) corporal punishment. At first, of course, there was no definite code for these proceedings, but the community (or later the bishop) had to decide the individual case. By degrees, however, legal principles were developed to regulate the life of the Church. Thus the Fathers distinguish between *peccatum* and *delictum* or *crimen,* and it is expressly recognized that a sin of thought alone is not subject to external or legal penalties. By the fourth century a definite basis is reached for the infliction of ecclesiastical penalties; for the severer, certain forms of apostasy, immorality and homicide; for the lighter, some cases of contact with paganism or neglect of Christian duties (e.g., of attendance at public worship). A distinction is drawn between *poena vindicativa* and *poena medicinalis* or *censura,* the latter having the amendment of the offender for its chief purpose and terminating with the removal of the offense. These latter are employed mainly against the clergy; those imposed on laymen, including excommunication, are all practically *vindicativae.* The exercise of jurisdiction over laymen and clergy below the rank of bishop belonged to the bishop, who was bound to consult his priests and deacons before pronouncing sentence. A court of appeal (and for bishops of first instance) existed in the provincial synod. The Synod of Sardica (343) provides, in case of the condemnation of a bishop, for an appeal from either party to the Bishop of Rome, who may either confirm the sentence or order a new investigation by neighboring bishops, together with priests delegated by him as assessors. On the basis of this decree, which never obtained ecumenical recognition, the popes based the claim to supreme jurisdiction, and to a right of judging in the first instance all metropolitans, primates, and patriarchs; and such a claim was carried into practical effect throughout a large part of the West, under the sanction of the imperial power.

A similar sanction was given to the competence of other ecclesiastical tribunals; and certain offenses against ecclesiastical law, especially the abandonment of the Catholic faith, were made crimes under secular law; secular penalties were also imposed upon some offenses against discipline on the part of the clergy (such as gambling, illegal marriage, wilful abandonment of the clerical state). By Roman law, however, the clergy were not exempted from secular jurisdiction, except that bishops accused of a breach of secular law were to be tried first by a synod of their peers, who were nevertheless obliged to hand over a convicted offender to the State after the imposition of their own penalty, until Justinian reserved the right to sanction secular proceedings against a bishop to the emperor alone.

3. The Merovingian Period.

During the Merovingian period, the character of excommunication was changed by the acceptance of the doctrine of the indelibility of baptism, which rendered a complete and absolute separation from the Church impossible, while desertion of the Church's faith was unlawful and punishable. Besides the earlier penalties there were now added flogging for slaves and inferior persons, imprisonment in a monastery, and in the Visigothic kingdom banishment, decalvation (scalping), confiscation of property, money fines, the loss of secular dignities, and reduction to slavery. In this period corporal punishment was applied to clerics in major orders as well as minor. The performance of works of penance was now enforced as a penalty, either alone or with others, for life, for a fixed period, or until amendment or removal by ecclesiastical superiors. The judicial system remained much as before, except that the policy of the Visigothic and Frankish kingdoms left little room for appeals to the pope. In regard to the judgment of clerical offenders, the Frankish law was that crimes punishable by death or exile (treason, homicide, robbery) were referred, in the case of bishops, to a provincial or national synod, and when this had pronounced sentence of deposition the offender came under royal jurisdiction for death, banishment, or confiscation. As to the lower clergy, the Church as early as the sixth century demanded a change in the old Roman law, requiring the secular courts to abstain from all action until the bishop had proceeded against the accused in the way of ecclesiastical discipline. The edict of Clothair II. (614) conceded this in regard to priests and deacons, and forbade the execution of capital punishment upon them until they had first been deposed by ecclesiastical authority.

From the ninth to the sixteenth century, the system of jurisdiction received its further development, and has remained practically unchanged in the Roman Catholic Church since the latter date.

4. The Carolingian and Later Periods.

Partly through the Carolingian capitularies, and then through a long series of papal enactments, a number of further secular penalties were imposed upon offenders, of the most varied kind, including the deposition of kings and princes, the absolution of their subjects from allegiance, the piercing of the tongue for blasphemy, death for sodomy and abortion, withdrawal of all communication with Christians for Jews, etc., etc. The Roman Catholic Church has not yet abandoned the medieval view that it is entitled to inflict secular penalties, though in consequence of the changed relations between Church and State these have fallen into disuse against laymen, except infamy regarded as a ground of irregularity; and the Church is empowered by modern legislation to inflict them upon the clergy only in the forms of money fines and confinement in a house of correction. In the line of purely spiritual penalties, there were added the local Interdict (q.v.), the refusal of Christian burial as a separate penalty, suspension from particular churchly rights, incapacity to hold ecclesiastical offices, and the *indignatio* of the pope (loss of papal favor and breaking off of communication). Apart from the limitation of the prohibition of intercourse with excommunicated persons (see Excommunication), a distinction was made in the eighteenth century between suspension from the privileges of church membership (for which in this period the terms *interdictum personale, interdictum ingressus ecclesiae* came into use) and the minor excommunication.

By the end of the twelfth century, in connection with the development of the doctrine of the indelibility of holy orders and the struggle of the Church to maintain the *privilegium fori* for its clergy, the earlier penalty of deposition was distinguished into two classes—what was now called deposition, and degradation. The former deprived the offender of his office and benefice, of the right to exercise his orders, and of the capacity to be again employed in the service of the Church; the latter, in addition, took away from him all the privileges of the clerical state, and delivered him over to the jurisdiction of secular tribunals. This was employed only in definitely fixed grave crimes, especially heresy.

5. Deposition, Degradation, and Suspension.

Deprivation, which does not render the offender incapable of holding another benefice, was seldom used before the twelfth century, but has been frequent since. A modern variation of it is the removal of a cleric from one benefice to another less desirable one. Suspension has also been developed in detail, and may be *ab officio, ab ordine, a beneficio*, or *totalis*, from all three. The Council of Trent gave the right to bishops to inflict suspension *ab officio* or *ab ordine* for a sin not publicly known without any preliminary hearing; the only recourse lies to the pope.

A distinction, first occurring in the Visigothic kingdom at the end of the sixth century, has since been made between *poenae ferendae sententiae* and *poenae latae sententiae*. The latter class take effect immediately upon the commission of the act with which they are connected, without requiring any judicial process. Excommunication and suspension when they are penalties *ferendae sententiae*, require a threefold or at least a single peremptory admonition before they can be imposed, thus giving the offender an opportunity to avert the penalty by the performance of due penance. From the twelfth century on, both the popes and general and local councils established an inordinate number of penalties *latae sententiae;* but Pius IX., in the constitution *Apostolicae sedis* of 1869, abolished all those which rested on the common law, the later general councils, and the papal constitutions, with the exception of such as were established by the Council of Trent, had to do with papal elections and the internal management of orders, congregations, collegiate bodies, and church institutions, or were expressly named in this decree.

In regard to the development of the matter covered by ecclesiastical penalties, in the Carolingian period the offenses legislated against were in large measure those of a grave moral nature,

6. Matters Calling for Penalty.

such as sexual immorality, perjury, and robbery. After the eleventh century, the papal legislation is determined predominantly by the hierarchical interests of the Church, and directed against heresy, the invasion of ecclesiastical liberties, the subjection of clerics to secular tribunals, the appropriation by laymen of ecclesiastical property, lay investiture, and the like. It is true, however, that a large number of penalties provided against the neglect of spiritual duties (the keeping of Sunday, the Easter duty, fasting), and against robbery, false coinage, desertion of children, tournaments, false accusation, abuse of power, and so on; and that the Church, by the erection of the " Truce of God " (q.v.) into a general institution, did much to put down a large class of crimes against person and property. But in spite of all these undeniable services to civilization, it still remains true that where the criminal legislation of the medieval pope is determined by any clear and consistent policy, it is in cases affecting the position of the Church as a hierarchical power.

If the earlier penal legislation of the Church is of a purely occasional character, with no attempt to build up a thorough-going system, the same is true to a large extent of the period from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century, including the Tridentine alone among general councils. And again, although the council deals with such ethical crimes as dueling, adultery, seduction and forced marriage, and the papal constitutions with such others as bigamy, sodomy, the slave-trade, piracy, wrecking, and the bearing of false witness, they still impose the majority of their penalties upon what may be called hierarchical offenses. It is for these that the latest constitution of the kind, the *Apostolicae sedis*, maintains the penalties *latae sententiae*, which it keeps up for dueling and abortion alone among offenses of a general ethical nature.

7. The Organ of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction.

The principal organ for the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction on this system is the pope, who since the twelfth century has succeeded in maintaining his claim to be the *judex ordinarius singulorum.* The Council of Trent, however, following the precedents of the Concordat of Basel and the Council of Constance, decreed that controverted questions should come in the first instance before the bishops. The direct jurisdiction of the pope finds its greatest practical significance in regard to the ecclesiastical dignitaries whose immediate superior he is, the cardinals and metropolitans, and outside of these to the bishops. The Council of Trent, in subjecting the latter to his jurisdiction, did but confirm the established medieval law from the end of the eleventh century, that in all cases of serious offenses, for which degradation, deposition or deprivation were the penalties, they should be wholly subject to papal decision, while less grave matters might be dealt with by the provincial councils.

The Council of Trent, again following the two earlier reforming councils, attempted to exclude as far as possible the final decision of cases in Rome, and so provided for the nomination by provincial or diocesan synods of certain clerics to be known as *judices synodales* to whom the pope might delegate the decision of certain cases brought before him. This arrangement never had much practical significance, as the popes preferred to place appeals in the hands of their nuncios or of archbishops and bishops, or in some cases to give the nuncios the appointment of those who should hear them. At the present time many cases are finally disposed of by the Roman congregations, especially the *Congregatio concilii* and the *Congregatio episcoporum et regularium* (see CURIA).

8. Competence of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction.

In regard to the competence of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the Church has always claimed the right to punish any violation of its ordinances either by clergy or by laity, independently of the question whether the offense was also against secular law. As long as it employed purely ecclesiastical penalties, there could be no conflict between the two jurisdictions. This was the case not only under the Roman empire but also in the Merovingian and Carolingian periods—all the more because the Germanic penal code contained but few crimes on which public punishment was inflicted. Up to the twelfth century the Church was thus able to fill up a serious gap in penal legislation by taking cognizance of a number of grave crimes for which the secular law provided no public penalty. When, from the twelfth century on, the latter began to increase the number of crimes which it punished, conflicts could no longer be avoided, and the secular tribunals protested against the invasion of their rights by the Church courts. In practise, then, there developed out of these conditions a distinction of offenses into *delicta mere secularia, delicta mere ecclesiastica*, and *delicta mixta* or *mixti fori.* No general agreement could be or has been reached as to what constitutes the third class, in which both secular and ecclesiastical authorities have competence. Usually it has been held to include the principal offenses against chastity, usury, sorcery, magic, perjury, blasphemy, and the forgery of papal briefs. For modern practice see below, II. The action of the Church against secular offenses is thus confined nowadays almost wholly to the *forum internum*, i.e., to the imposition of penance in the confessional; and the established ecclesiastical courts only take part in the process in so far as it is a question of cases reserved to the pope or bishop for decision (see CASUS RESERVATI).

9. Secular Jurisdiction over the Clergy.

The question of secular jurisdiction over the clergy was raised early in the ninth century by ecclesiastical reformers, with the help of the forgeries of Benedictus Levita and the pseudo-Isidore; and they succeeded to a large extent in enforcing their claim of Exemption (q.v.). Throughout the Middle Ages, indeed, secular rulers maintained their right to punish even bishops for a breach of their obligations as vassals, officials, or subjects, with imprisonment or exile; but they made no attempt, except in rare instances, to exercise a power of deposition, which by the eleventh century was recognized as a right reserved to the pope. In respect to the other clergy, the Church's claim was never acknowledged for clerics who were not recognizable as such by the tonsure and clerical garb, and with the fourteenth century a strong reaction began against such exemption, which finally led to its complete abolition in most countries. The Church, however, still held to it in theory, even in the Syllabus of 1864.

10. Method of Procedure.

The opening of ecclesiastical proceedings was conditioned from the earliest times by the notoriety of the offense, or by self-denunciation on the offender's part, or by the accusation of another; or it might follow *ex officio* when the authorities had sufficient cause, as in well-grounded suspicion. In all these cases, the bishop might proceed first by a brotherly admonition, on the basis of Matt. xviii. 15–17 (the so-called *denunciatio evangelica*); if the offender remained obstinate, formal trial and punishment might follow, or in the opposite case he might take upon himself the canonical penance without being shut out of the communion of the Church. From the fourth century the Church adopted the Roman regulations in regard to accusations: the formal charge to be signed by the accuser, the obligation to prove the charge, and the *lex talionis*, instead of which excommunication was frequently the penalty for accusers who failed to follow up or to prove their charges. Under the influence of Germanic ideas, the Church further adopted the oath of purgation, especially in the case of clergy who had been tried and not convicted, when some suspicion still remained. The compurgators were dropped, and the process was regarded less as a privilege of the accused than as his duty, to clear himself from suspicion. In the Carolingian period the Frankish Church employed still more of the Germanic procedure; the accused had the right to clear himself by an oath, and if it was made with compurgators he went free of either the charge or the suspicion (in case of *ex officio* proceedings). Under the joint influence of the Roman and Germanic systems, by the end of the eleventh century this had become the common law of the Church, except that the accuser in the case of clerics was always required to prove his charge. The *purgatio canonica* was opposed to the *purgatio vulgaris* or Wager of Battle (q.v.), which the popes were endeavoring to suppress. The objection to the use of this method in *ex officio* proceedings, that it allowed no objective investigation of the offenses suspected to have been committed, and the need of stricter discipline for the clergy, especially in view of the increasing accusations brought against them by the heretical sects, caused Innocent III. to reform the procedure in *ex officio* cases, distinguishing two courses, *per inquisitionem* and *per denunciationem*. The former was rather a disciplinary than a criminal process, and permitted purgation by oath when no positive result had been reached by the investigation, or when the preliminary proceedings had raised a strong presumption in favor of innocence. The other process required the *denunciatio evangelica* to precede further action, which followed the course of criminal procedure in case of recalcitrancy. But this method gradually disappeared from the practise of the Church in consequence of the limitation of its power over the laity in criminal cases. There was the less need for it when, as was frequently the case from the fifteenth century, special officials (called *promotores* or *procuratores fiscales*) were appointed as assessors to the ecclesiastical courts, to investigate suspected crimes or disciplinary offenses, bring them before the courts, and represent the public interests at the trial. By the seventeenth century, when the *denunciatio evangelica* had ceased to be practical in view of the office of these *promotores*, and when the requirement of an *insinuatio clamosa* or *infamia* for the opening of a process *per inquisitionem* had lost its significance, the place of both methods was taken by a modified form of the latter, the purpose of which was to establish the facts, whether they pointed to the guilt or the innocence of the accused. The *purgatio canonica*, for which in any case it was increasingly difficult to find compurgators, was out of place in this form of procedure, and disappeared with the seventeenth century. Since papal legislation had made no attempt at a universal reconstruction of the penal and disciplinary procedure from the pontificate of Innocent III. until the beginning of the nineteenth century, the newer system developed variously in different places; but there was a general tendency, caused by the limitation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and by the diminution of the revenues which had formerly supported the courts, to dispense with all but the essential forms. A similar tendency is displayed in the instructions of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars issued in 1880, which sets forth an improved and simplified form of procedure, to take place privately and in writing, and allows the bishops to use it when the older form is impossible or inexpedient.

2. Administrative and Civil Jurisdiction: The development of the civil jurisdiction of the Church is described under AUDIENTIA EPISCOPALIS. Besides this, the imperial legislation expressly recognized the competence of the bishops *de religione*, i.e., in controversies to be decided according to ecclesiastical rules, concerning, for example, the right to the incumbency of Church offices. In Gaul also such matters were under the jurisdiction of the bishops and synods; but since there was a difference of law between Church and State, and the State did not undertake to execute the ecclesiastical decisions, those matters which required state action (matrimonial causes, questions of church property, etc.) came before the secular courts. In 614 the Church succeeded in getting all cases *de possessione* (questions of property, to be settled by award, not by public penalty) in which the clergy were concerned before its courts. In the Carolingian period the claims of the Church were recognized by the ordinance that disputes between clerics should be settled by the bishop, and that the bishop should sit with the court in any question *de possessione* between clerics and laymen. In the Middle Ages the Church succeeded to a great extent in enforcing its contention that the laity had no competence in ecclesiastical matters, helped by the contrast between the confusion or weakness of secular courts and its own prompt and thorough execution of its decisions, with the power of excommunication to back them. According to the canon law, the spiritual courts took cognizance of all *causae incidentes spirituales* (those which touched the sacraments or offices of the Church, especially marriage); the *causae spiritualibus annexae* (such as the right of patronage, tithes, betrothals, wills, and agreements ratified by oath); *causae civiles ecclesiasticis accessoriae* (questions of dowry, legitimacy, etc.). Further, all civil proceedings, in so far as the injustice of one party could be construed as sin, might be brought into the church courts; and so might the cases of *personae miserabiles* (widows, orphans, paupers, pilgrims), as well as those in which secular judges denied justice. Clergy, monks and nuns, all ecclesiastical institutions, crusaders belonged in any case to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, except in cases of feudal rights. Here also the Roman Catholic Church still clings to these claims in theory, although they have long ceased to be practical in most countries. (P. HINSCHIUS†.)

II. The Protestant Churches: The jurisdiction exercised at the present time by the churches of western Europe and the United States differs

1. Modern Trend.

both in nature and extent from the jurisdiction of the ancient and medieval Church. The changes have been brought about very largely by the changed relations of political and ecclesiastical institutions. These modifications have been developing since the sixteenth century and have paralleled the changes in doctrine and forms of worship. They have at times originated with the churches themselves, but more frequently have resulted from the action of the civil power. While the jurisdiction of the medieval Church covered to a varying extent the institution of marriage, the execution and probate of wills, and the descent of property, and included also a considerable minor criminal jurisdiction over the clergy, the modern churches are by the State deprived of such jurisdiction and confined to matters defined by the civil power as purely spiritual in their objects. Where an ecclesiastical body is by law established, as is the case with the Church of England (see ENGLAND, CHURCH OF), the civil power fixes for the Church its organization and jurisdiction. The modifications since the Reformation have been gradual. The changes in jurisdiction have been most radical where, as in the United States, the Church has ceased to be a governmental institution.

2. Fundamental Law in the United States.

The sphere of ecclesiastical jurisdiction exercised by the American churches has been outlined by the supreme court of the United States in the case of Watson vs. Jones (13 Wallace, U. S. Reports 679, as follows:

> "In this country the full and free right to entertain any religious belief, to practise any religious principle, and to teach any religious doctrine which does not violate the laws of morality and property, and which does not infringe personal rights, is conceded to all. The law knows no heresy, is committed to the support of no dogma, the establishment of no sect. The right to organize voluntary religious associations to assist in the expression of any religious doctrine and to create tribunals for the decision of controverted questions of faith within the association, and for the ecclesiastical government of all the individual members, congregations and officers within the general association is unquestioned. All who unite themselves to such a body do so with an implied consent to this government and are bound to submit to it. But it would be a vain consent and would lead to the total suppression of such religious bodies, if any one aggrieved by one of their decisions could appeal to the secular courts and have them reversed. It is of the essence of these religious unions, and of their right to establish tribunals for the decisions arising among themselves, that those decisions should be binding in all cases of ecclesiastical cognizance, subject only to such appeals as the organism itself provides for."

This sphere of liberty for the purpose of religion has been defined in detail by principles laid down by the civil power. While modern states have in some cases relinquished the power to legislate in ecclesiastical matters, they have everywhere reserved the power to define the sphere of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and no matter what may be the desires of a church body for added powers over its members, the rule of the State is absolute. Modern states, in defining the powers of bodies organized for the purposes of religion, have not enacted formal codes stating the jurisdiction of such bodies in detail; but they have laid down general principles in the civil courts in the adjudication of cases brought about through church controversies. The civil courts of the United States have in the century past developed some fundamental principles applicable to all the religious organizations of the land which have become law wherever American sovereignty has been extended. Similar principles have been worked out by the civil courts in all parts of the British empire.

3. Elementary Principles.

The basic principle of modern ecclesiastical jurisdiction is that all ecclesiastical relations must be voluntary both in their inception and in their duration. This rule applies as well to church membership as to the holding of ecclesiastical office. No ecclesiastical relations are of the nature of a civil contract in law. The closest juridical analogy is to an obligation in equity. Such relations can be severed at any time without incurring civil disabilities. The polity of the denomination and the obligations laid down in a discipline as assumed by a member do not, from the standpoint of the State, change the voluntary character of the relationship. Another elementary principle limiting ecclesiastical jurisdiction is that the law of the land is law for the churches. So much of the civil law as applies must be read into the internal or canon law of all religious organizations. So also the internal law of religious bodies can validly contain nothing that contradicts the principles of the common and statute law of the land. The churches, therefore, may enact no rule overriding, restraining, or curtailing the civil rights of their members. Nor can the churches make a valid attempt to exempt their members from their civil and political obligations. Thus a church body may not validly discipline its members for exercising the elective franchise or serving upon juries or taking up arms in defense of the State. A further limitation of ecclesiastical jurisdiction is found in the principle that church courts can not with legal sanction adjudicate civil controversies among their members, although the parties may have voluntarily submitted their cases to such courts. No decision can be rendered that will bar the parties from their right of appeal to the civil courts.

4. Limits of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction.

With these as fundamental principles of limitation found in the polity of all the states of western civilization, modern ecclesiastical jurisdiction and discipline are definitely limited to the conduct of moral and spiritual operations, cooperation for the purposes of religion, propaganda of faith, charity, and education. The churches are at liberty to define their faith and to regulate their own affairs. They may lay down rules of conduct for their members and prescribe what manner of life they shall live. Such a life, however, must be in accord with the prevailing standards of public morality, and such standards are in the last analysis fixed by the exercise of the police power of the State by the civil authorities. In many instances modern religious organizations have endeavored to prescribe for their members modes of life not in accordance with the prevailing standards of public morality. There have been attempts to institute abnormal relations of the sexes, the infliction of physical suffering, cruel penance, exhausting tests of physical endurance, and lewd assemblies, and acts which constitute a disturbance of the public peace. All such acts on the part of religious bodies bring about the intervention of the civil power. No argument based upon any assumed sanction of revealed religion will validate such acts. Within these well-defined limits the churches may exercise a complete and detailed jurisdiction over their members. They can bring members to trial for violations of discipline and for acts and modes of life contrary to the principles of their faith. They are at liberty to prescribe the rules by which their courts shall be organized and the procedure of trials. Such courts are under legal obligation to proceed according to the law of the body that created them, and should they not live up to their own law, their decisions can be set aside by the civil courts.

5. Legal Aspects of Discipline.

The discipline that can be meted out to church members upon the findings of church courts may extend only (1) to admonition, (2) suspension of privileges, (3) penance, (4) excommunication, and (5) expulsion from membership. If the church law provides for an appeal to a higher judicatory, such an appeal may not be refused by the trial court. If an appeal be refused, the higher judicatories may be compelled by the civil courts to entertain it. If the decision of a church court affects the civil rights as well as the ecclesiastical relations of a church member, so much of the decision as relates to the civil rights will be regarded by the civil courts as null and void, while due effect will be given to so much of the decision as affects purely ecclesiastical relations. Where membership in a particular congregation carries with it the right of sepulture in a certain ground, the loss of membership will result in the loss of that right, as the civil courts have held that such a right is a privilege that can be lost with membership. Marriage, the annulment of marriage, and divorce are now matters within the exclusive jurisdiction of the civil courts, so that church discipline in relation to these matters is entirely without legal effect and can affect only the ecclesiastical standings of the parties.

6. Relations of Churches and Officers.

In general the same principles govern the jurisdiction that the churches exercise over their ministers and other officials. Here the modern jurisdiction is in deepest contrast with that of the medieval Church. From the standpoint of civil law the holding of ecclesiastical office is entirely a voluntary matter, no perpetual tenure or obligation being possible. Any ecclesiastical office may be renounced at any time without incurring civil disabilities. One who accepts office in a religious body voluntarily assumes the obligation to obey the rules of that body not only in all matters pertaining to his office but also as to the mode of life required of him. Under the principles of modern ecclesiastical jurisdiction church office is not a civil right, but is in the nature of a vested interest to be enjoyed upon a certain tenure. In several ways the State recognizes the ministry of the churches. Ordained ministers and priests are among those authorized by the State to perform the marriage ceremony, and such church officials are exempt from jury duty and from enforced military service. The civil courts will entertain the case of a church official when deprived of his office in any other manner than according to the law of the organization to which he belongs. The deposed official can appeal to the civil courts for restitution and can compel the church authorities to grant him a trial according to the law of the body. If, however, he has been duly tried and properly deprived of his office, he has no redress in the civil courts, as he has not been deprived of a civil right and his relation to his church was not contractual. Although the discipline of a church body may require that its ordained ministers refrain from secular employment as means of livelihood, an ordained minister or priest has no claim on his church or superior officials for support unless such a claim is specifically recognized by the law of the church. The penalties which may be prescribed by the judgment of an ecclesiastical court rendered against an official are: (1) censure, (2) the temporary suspension of the right to exercise the functions of his office, (3) deprivation of his office, and (4) expulsion from church membership. No financial penalties can be inflicted nor can the defendant be compelled to share the costs of trial. The church courts have no power to compel the attendance of witnesses, but they can compel, with the aid of the civil courts, the production of books and papers in the custody of those over whom they have jurisdiction. The proceedings of ecclesiastical courts need not be made public, but in the event of testimony being given in public or such testimony being subsequently published and proved false on material points, such testimony may constitute libel and an action will lie for damages for defamation of character.

When there is controversy as to the person entitled to a church office, the civil courts will not take the initiative, but if a proper action can be planned involving the title to property, especially in the case of church trustees, the civil courts will take cognizance of the matter collaterally. Such matters come within the equity jurisdiction of the civil courts. The methods employed by the civil courts when they intervene in ecclesiastical matters are usually the issue of writs of mandamus directed to the ecclesiastical authorities compelling certain action, or the issue of writs of injunction restraining certain proposed action. In case a deposed church official has had in his possession funds belonging to the organization, an action for an accounting will lie in the same manner as against any civil treasurer or trustee.

GEORGE JAMES BAYLES.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For the early Church consult: Bingham, *Origines*, II., iv.–vii.; J. Fulton, *Index canonum; Greek text and Eng. transl. and Complete Digest of the . . . Code of Canon Law of the . . . primitive Church*, New York, 1883.

For the Roman Catholic Church consult: *Corpus juris canonici*, ed. A. L. Richter and A. Friedberg, Leipsic, 1879 (best edition); E. Friedberg, *De finium inter ecclesiam et civitatem regundorum judicio*, Leipsic, 1861; W.

Molitor, *Ueber kanonisches Gerichtsverfahren gegen Kleriker*, Mainz, 1856; F. Kober, *Die Suspension der Kirchendiener*, Tübingen, 1862; idem, *Deposition und Degradation nach den Grundsätzen des kirchlichen Rechts*, ib. 1867; D. Bouix, *Tractatus de judiciis ecclesiasticis*, 2 vols., Paris, 1866; N. München, *Das kanonische Gerichtsverfahren und Strafrecht*, 2 vols., Cologne, 1866; J. F. von Schulte, *Ueber Kirchenstrafen, Berlin*, 1872; F. Droste, *Kirchliches Disziplinar und Kriminalverfahren gegen Geistliche*, Paderborn, 1881; E. Katz, *Grundriss des kanonischen Strafrechts*, Berlin, 1881; *Jura sacerdotum vindicata*, New York, 1883; P. Pievantonelli, *Praxis fori ecclesiastici*, Rome, 1883; P. Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht . . . in Deutschland*, vols. iv.–vi., Berlin, 1886–97; A. Nissl, *Der Gerichtsstand des Klerus im fränkischen Reich*, Innsbruck, 1886; A. L. Richter, *Lehrbuch des . . . Kirchenrechts*, §§ 206–210, 212–226, Leipsic, 1886; R. Sohm, *Geistliche Gerichtsbarkeit im fränkischen Reich*, in *Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht*, ix (1889), 193 sqq.; S. B. Smith, *Elements of Ecclesiastical Law*, 3 vols., New York, 1893; C. Gross, *Lehrbuch des katholischen Kirchenrechts*, Vienna, 1894; E. Friedberg, *Lehrbuch des . . . Kirchenrechts*, 100, 101, 103–107, Leipsic, 1895; A. T. Wirgman, *Constitutional Authority of the Bishops in the Catholic Church*, New York, 1899; J. B. Saegmüller, *Lehrbuch des katholischen Kirchenrechts*, Freiburg, 1900–04; W. von Brünneck, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Kirchenrechts in den deutschen Kolonisationslanden*, 2 parts, Berlin, 1902–04.

For the German Evangelical Churches consult: O. Mejer, *Kirchenzucht und Konsistorial-Kompetenz*, Rostock, 1851; G. Galli, *Die lutherischen und calvinistischen Kirchenstrafen gegen Laien im Reformationszeitalter*, Breslau, 1879; A. L. Richter, ut sup., §§ 211, 227–231; R. Frank, *Die neueren Disziplinargesetze der deutsch-evangelischen Landeskirchen*, Marburg, 1890; E. Friedberg, ut sup., §§ 102, 108–109; K. Köhler, *Lehrbuch des . . . Kirchenrechts*, pp. 194, 258, Berlin, 1895.

For Protestant Churches in Great Britain consult: J. Brownbill, *Principles of English Canon Law*, London; 1883; *Constitution and Law of the Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1884; *Compendium of the Acts of General Assembly Relating to Procedure in Church Courts*, ib. 1886; H. W. Cripps, *Treatise on the Law Relating to the Church and Clergy*, London, 1886; W. Mair, *Digest of Laws Relating to the Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1887; F. H. L. Errington, *Clergy Discipline Act, 1892*, London, 1892; T. B. Hardern, *Church Discipline*, Cambridge, 1892; J. Chitty, *Statutes Relating to Church and Clergy*, London, 1894; R. J. Phillimore, *Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England*, 2 vols., ib. 1895; F. W. Maitland, *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*, Cambridge, 1898; H. Hardy, *Ecclesiastical Proceedings under the Clergy Discipline Acts*, London, 1899; H. Miller, *A Guide to Ecclesiastical Law*, London, 1899; J. H. Blunt, *The Book of Church Law*, ib. 1901; T. E. Smith, *Summary of the Law and Practice in the Ecclesiastical Courts*, ib. 1902; J. M. Duncan, *The Parochial Ecclesiastical Law of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1903; W. H. Frere, *The Relation of Church and Parliament in Regard to Ecclesiastical Discipline*, Oxford, 1903; P. V. Smith, *The Law of Churchwardens and Sidesmen*, London, 1903; idem, *Legal Position of the Clergy*, ib. 1905. For the United States: E. Buck, *Ecclesiastical Law*, Boston, n.d.; R. H. Tyler, *American Ecclesiastical Law*, Albany, 1866; M. Hoffman, *Ecclesiastical Law in New York*, New York, 1868; L. T. Townsend, *Handbook upon Church Trials*, ib. 1885; C. B. Howell, *The Church and Civil Law*, Detroit, 1886; S. B. Smith, ut sup.; also, *New Procedure in Criminal and Disciplinary Causes of Ecclesiastics*, New York, 1887; W. D. Wilson, *American Church Law*, ib. 1889; H. J. Desmond, *The Church and the Law*, Chicago, 1898; and the literature under CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

JUSTICE, ETHICAL, AND EQUITY: Justice (in the ethical sense) in itself is the maintenance of positive legal order, assuring the peaceful and thriving existence of human society, the supreme political virtue—*justitia regnorum fundamentum.* Aristotle distinguishes *justitia distributiva et correctiva.* The first distributes riches, power, and honor according to desert; the other compensates for inequalities and balances the loss and gain in the transactions of life. Justice provides the exact proportion of duties and rights, and punishes every violation of positive legal order. Justice establishes general lines of direction by laws, which prove themselves emanations of justice whenever they correspond to the original conception of right and reveal it in the decisions and ordinances based upon them.

Equity (Lat. *aequitas*, Gk. *isotēs*) is to be associated with justice. What the latter establishes in a general way, sometimes appears insufficient when applied to the individual case—*summum jus, summa injuria.* What is just in general and what is individually just may diverge considerably. In such a case equity regards and vindicates rationality of natural right and corrects positive law in its too wide or too narrow comprehension.

Justice as a personal quality is the demeanor of man in accordance with the legal order, his rectitude. Its principle is exact compensation—*suum cuique.* Benevolence can not stand in its place. Rectitude obliges us to conscientious practising of the law, even when thereby evil may arise to our neighbor. It is wrong and contrary to our duty to spare him out of fear or weakness. In actual practise rectitude becomes probity or honesty.

Here also equity forms the morally indispensable complement of rectitude (Col. iv. 1). In our conduct toward our neighbor equity consists in yielding up and desisting from our just claims, where, relentlessly pursuing them, we should damage the neighbor in a degree detrimental to charity; and, on the other hand, in acknowledging and fulfilling claims of our neighbor on us which are not founded on strict legality, if they are of true profit to him and if we do not neglect other duties by complying with them. In the union of rectitude and equity alone true justice of moral conduct is achieved.

(KARL BURGER†.)

In theology justice has been given many significations. In the doctrine of the divine attributes it has been regarded as an inviolable characteristic of holiness, and as such has been set over against love as its opposite (see HOLINESS). It has, however, been most important in relation to theories of the atonement. On the one hand, justice has been defined as "general" or "rectoral" and "distributive," where "general" justice refers to the well-being and "distributive" to what is due the individual. In the atonement the latter was conceived as suspended in favor of the former (cf. E. A. Park, *The Atonement, Discourses*, etc., Boston, 1859). On the other hand, it has been maintained that justice (righteousness) must be satisfied before love could offer pardon to the sinner (see SATISFACTION). The word has been employed also to designate the original state of man as one of integrity, obedience to God, and harmony of all personal powers. Moreover, it represents that renewed condition in which man as forgiven stands toward God and his law—a putative position to the unmerited favor of God. In its deepest sense justice and love in God are identical, while in man justice pertains to character and voluntary actions.

JUSTIFICATION.

I. New Testament Doctrine.
  Paul's Doctrine of Righteousness (§ 1).
  Relations of Faith and Righteousness (§ 2).
  Johannean Doctrine (§ 3).
  Other New-Testament Writers (§ 4).
II. History of the Doctrine.
  Patristic Doctrine till Augustine (§ 1).
  Augustine's Teaching (§ 2).
  Scholastic and Roman Catholic Teaching (§ 3).
  The Lutheran Position (§ 4).
  Later Views (§ 5).
  Ritschl and Dorner (§ 6).
III. Doctrinal Discussion.
  The Fundamental Position (§ 1).
  Justification Establishes New Relations with God (§ 2).
  Conditions of Justification (§ 3).
  Relations of Faith and Justification (§ 4).
  Justification and Baptism (§ 5).
  Conclusion (§ 6).
  Additional Note (§ 7).

1. Paul's Doctrine of Righteousness.

I. New-Testament Doctrine: In the Scriptural presentation one starts naturally with Paul. He alone of the first witnesses of the Gospel had the inner experience of the sharp opposition between Old-Testament piety and the new thing in Christ out of which as an inevitable interpretation the doctrine of justification arose. After his conversion he was completely occupied with the contrast between his own righteousness and God's righteousness, between the works of the law and faith, between Law and Gospel. Any mistake alleged against Paul's earlier life could not be attributed to the law; nor may one adduce a radical distinction between Galatians and Romans. Both affirm that the law was given "because of transgressions" (Gal. iii. 19), "that sin . . . might become exceeding sinful" (Rom. vii. 13); in the redemptive history, however, both see in the law a divine ordinance, and in faith in Christ a fulfilment of this law (Rom. xiii. 8, 10; Gal. v. 14). For his failure to fulfil the law Paul blames neither the law nor his own zeal (Phil. iii. 6). A bitter experience had convinced him of the impossibility of a perfect righteousness under the law. One who with such sincerity and energy seeks to unify his action, can hardly have failed before his conversion to struggle with the doubt (cf. Rom. vii. 7 sqq.) whether he could really fulfil the law of God. As a Pharisee he could not resolve this doubt by a renewed effort after a righteousness of his own, and therefore a righteousness proceeding from the law. The appearance of the exalted Lord convinced him that the one he was persecuting in the name of God was the Messiah. This experience was indeed individual, but it was an instance of the universal weakness of man's fleshly nature (Rom. viii. 3) which no law could quicken (Gal. iii. 21). In the Epistle to the Romans Paul showed that with reference to justification by faith the Jew has no advantage over the Gentile. The law which pronounces a curse upon all men can not, however, be given for this purpose, but for a "schoolmaster, to bring us to Christ" (Gal. iii. 24).

2. Relations of Faith and Righteousness.

The righteousness of God with which the Gospel is concerned can mean only either an attribute or a relation of God (Rom. i. 17, 19), or else a righteousness created by God (II Cor. v. 20; Rom. x. 3). In any case, it is directly opposed to Pharisaic self-righteousness under the law; having its sole source in God, man is only a recipient of it. The significance of faith appears in two characteristic passages of Paul (Rom. iii. 26 and II Cor. v, 21). Thus righteousness or communion with God is possible in Christ, since only in him in virtue of his atonement is there righteousness. This divine arrangement for salvation must be realized by the subordination of man in the form of faith (Rom. x. 3 sqq.). Legal justification being impossible, faith in Christ alone remains. The distinction between law-works and faith was for Paul the fundamental question of religion, viz., whether communion with God is from man or from God; if the latter, it can be experienced by faith alone. Faith includes an intellectual element—related to historical facts, as the death and resurrection of Jesus, yet only so far as by means of these facts Christ has become what he is for man. According to its peculiar nature, however, faith is essentially trust in the person of the Lord in its historical and present meaning. Wherever faith is there is also a condition of justification as God's act. This signifies not a making but a declaring righteous (cf. Luke xviii. 14; Matt. xii. 37; Gal. iii. 11; Rom. iii. 20, iv. 4; also the notion of forgiveness of sin, Rom. iv. 7). Further, this meaning accords with the entire understanding of Paulinism. Moreover, justification is both a result and a completion of the historical redemptive work of Christ. This has its continuity in the Word, and aims at the justification of the individual. Paul does not teach empirical sinlessness. He refers to a conflict of the flesh with the spirit and does not underestimate the danger of a Christian's falling into sin. He even applied this warning to himself and toward the end of his life knew of remaining imperfection; but this does not destroy the Christian position. One's safety lies in a constant renewal of that which the Christian has essentially, i.e., Christ and his righteousness. Joined with this in Paul's thought was the certainty of future perfection and blessedness. He urges the Christian to self-examination, but at the same time to a looking wholly away to Christ in faith. But faith is derived from the Holy Spirit, in it is given the possession of the Spirit—a witness of sonship, and even pledge and seal of salvation. According to the Synoptics Jesus' preaching seems at first opposed to Paul's message; over against his doctrine of justification, Jesus emphasized the permanent demand of the law, the judgment of works and even reward for the same. One asks only whether Paul's doctrine is a necessary inference from Jesus' self-witness. Jesus connects the kingdom, salvation, and the judgment with his own person, a fact which the disciples first understood after his suffering and death. Two remarks of Jesus concerning the meaning of his death (Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28) coincide with the ideas of Paul. With Jesus, forgiveness of sin occupies a central place, likewise *dikaiosynē*, "righteousness," although this both agrees with and diverges from Paul's view. Paul's presentation of the kingdom of God as a gift corresponds with that of Jesus. Jesus distinctly emphasizes the mutual relations between the religious and the ethical aspect of sonship. On the ethical side as a condition of entering that kingdom there is repentance. Faith is conceived as the right relation to Christ—trust not merely in his wonderful power to help, but in his person. Faith affirms that in him the kingdom of God has come and that he is the Messiah. Jesus complains of lack of faith, prays for increase of his disciples' faith, and he designates those as his followers who have faith in him. Of this the Pauline teaching is only a continuation.

3. Johannean Doctrine.

The self-witness of Jesus, according to John, stands in close relation to the Pauline circle of thought, yet with its own characteristic features. Paul's secret of religion recalls John's living communion with God. The Synoptics designate this as divine sonship, which in John is mediated through Jesus. Here both the person of Jesus and faith in him are far more strongly accentuated; also the saving significance of his death. The central good is the "life," which includes the forgiveness of sins—a present salvation and a future perfection. In sonship the ethical and religious elements are inseparable and conditioned through faith in Jesus and a new birth, wherein one discerns a leaning toward the Pauline view of the new birth as mediated by faith. In faith the aspect of trust is not lacking, but the intellectual element is conspicuous. There is an approach to Paul's idea of faith—the mystic fellowship with Christ. Nor is the ethical element wanting: "he that is born of God doeth no sin" is an ideal judgment and is to be understood empirically, as is Paul's statement that the Christian is dead to sin. More strongly than Paul, John affirms that the Christian is deceived who declares that he does not sin. Divine sonship is traced wholly to God's love, and the Christian is led to ground his salvation not on his love to God but on God's love to him, guaranteed in the sending of his Son and the atonement for sin.

4. Other New-Testament Writers.

In the rest of the New-Testament writings, James' Epistle mainly demands attention. The author's interest is wholly practical. The Christian community is presupposed, but the content of faith is never developed and no warning to the Christian community rests on it. Owing to uncertainty in the date of this epistle, no intentional polemic against Paul can be affirmed. One must, however, reckon with the possibility that James' presentation was directed against a practical abuse of Pauline preaching. James holds that a separation of faith and works is impossible; rather does faith prove itself alive through works. With reference to other passages in the New Testament: at Pentecost, salvation is connected with the person of the crucified and risen Christ, and forgiveness of sins with faith in him. With this agrees I Peter, where, however, faith appears rather as trust in the redemptive activity of Jesus, and the ethical element and fear before God are strongly accentuated. The Epistle to the Hebrews accords with Paul's view in emphasizing perfection (vii. 11) in Christ's work, and forgiveness of sins in baptism, as well as the enduring high priesthood of Christ.

1. Patristic Doctrine till Augustine.

II. History of the Doctrine: Outside of the canonical Scriptures one seeks in vain for a full conception of the Pauline doctrine of justification. Christianity is imperfectly understood. Men were aware of something completely new in Christianity, but could not specifically distinguish this from the law; thus Christianity was in danger of becoming a new law, and faith an obedient acceptance of revealed doctrine, to be completed by works. Of the Apostolic Fathers, Clement did not gain complete understanding of the Pauline faith. For salvation faith and works are combined, and even forgiveness of sins is mediated through love. Ethical action is based on the command of God. For Barnabas the content of the Gospel was the forgiveness of sins, yet he teaches that the way of light is the fulfilling of the law. In the Ignatian Epistles the thought not of faith but of the indwelling of God and Christ is prominent. Ignatius relates faith to the historical person of Christ and especially to his death—a trust which rescues from death. From him comes the formula, "first faith, then love." The Shepherd of Hermas and the second Clementine Epistle are the classic representatives of a Christianity which is profoundly convinced of the essential significance of faith as the foundation and power of the entire Christian position, but for the practise of the Christian life lays all weight on obedience to the divine requirements. Faith and works are the saving formula, and the doctrine of merit is adumbrated: fasting is better than prayer, alms better than both. In Hermas appears the thought of a supererogatory action which may hope for recompense from God. By Tertullian and Cyprian the notion of merit was made at home in the Church. Tertullian also marked out the path by which the Roman Church has sought to adjust merit to the religious character of Christianity. He knows of a supernatural endowment by which one is qualified for meritorious action. On the other hand, he does not know of a grace through which one becomes pleasing to God. Thus the entire Christian life is under the stamp of fear. The understanding prepares for a distinction between *natura* and *gratia*, but uses it only to obliterate the opposition of *gratia* and merit. It was more fatal still that the doctrine of Tertullian was made effective by the authority of Cyprian. Almsgiving is paralleled with the forgiveness of sins through baptism. No longer is justification by faith held in the Pauline sense; faith is acknowledgment of the truth; it is trust only as an expectation that God will not withhold reward for meritorious deeds. Yet one must not conclude that for actual piety the Evangelical thoughts of the Scriptures had wholly disappeared. These were still influential for personal piety. Augustine reminds those who cavil at his notion of grace of the prayers and institutions of the Church. Even the Didache had required confession of sins before the sacrifice of the Lord's day. And Tertullian's piety was not simply self-righteousness, as one may see from his tractate on baptism and his writing concerning repentance. Jovinian, as opposed to the idea of a special reward for supererogatory action, such as that of virginity, admits only a Christian position which rests on Christ and is established by faith and baptism, in which the Father and Son dwell in the believer.

2. Augustine's Teaching.

More clearly than Augustine, Ambrose rests salvation and the certainty of it on the historical work of Christ. Yet he advances the doctrine of merit, almsgiving, and especially virginity. To Augustine more than to any one the Roman Church owes its doctrine of justification. For him Christianity is a present rest in God —a conception, shaped, although not immediately, by his experience, first, of distance from God, and then by the inward commotion of a finding of God. His earlier, differing from his later, teaching on sin and grace is drawn not directly from his conflict with Pelagius but from his study of Paul and from Neoplatonic sources. His personal experience is for him the key, and as with Paul and later with Luther sin and grace are the two poles of all Christian knowledge. Outside of grace mankind is a "mass of lost souls" which may through God's grace be reunited to God. According to Augustine the Law said: "Do what thou orderest!" the Gospel: "Give what thou orderest!" That is, grace is preeminently a power of religious and ethical renewal. Concerning forgiveness of sins Augustine holds that (1) baptism as foundation of Christianity confers forgiveness of sins; (2) forgiveness is bound to justification; (3) there exists a continual forgiveness even for the baptized Christian. Fruitful for piety is the personality of Christ—his inner life, his humility, his entire manifestation the highest proof of love, his death the ground of forgiveness of sins. But grace through Christ is present by means of "word and sacrament," not clearly connected with Christ's historical work but in the strict sense creative. As operating or prevenient it establishes, as cooperating it alone sustains, the Christian position. From it comes justification, i.e., renewal, which makes one actually righteous; instead of evil concupiscence comes good concupiscence. The entire Christian life becomes a process of sanctification wherein is merit which the Christian must gain for himself. He teaches a justification by a faith that works through love. In *De fide et operibus*, along with faith, works are so emphasized as to make this writing valuable to Roman Catholic histories of dogma to-day. He approaches the Reformation doctrine when he gives a more mystical turn to faith—such a union with Christ that all that is Christ's becomes ours. In love to God a present life from and in God is attained. But here is no personal certainty of salvation.

3. Scholastic and Roman Catholic Teaching.

Scholastic theology adhered to Augustine's didactic definitions, at the same time it was influenced by the religious impulse originating in him. Yet here Semipelagianism and Augustinianism appeared in many shades of conflicting differences. According to the Tridentine confession, justification is not simply, but includes, forgiveness of sins. According to Thomas Aquinas, it is a consequence of forgiveness of sins—a physical infusion of grace. Other church teachers regard the connection as ethical, thus its elation to the historical redemptive work is uncertain. The infusion of grace is variously interpreted: the substance of the Holy Spirit is planted in men (Peter the Lombard); sanctifying grace is identified with love (Duns Scotus); the Tridentine seeks to combine both views. Later dogmatics side with Thomas. According to the Roman teaching, justifying grace is a pure gift of grace—a heritage from Augustine. Merit (*meritum de condigno*) is first grounded on sanctifying grace, while the corresponding action of man is rewarded by infusion of justifying grace (*meritum de congruo*). Concerning this the Tridentine was silent. Later theology teaches that grace is not given for merit. Yet if one does what he can he may humbly hope that God will lend his grace. Others do not admit a psychological necessity of a preparation for reception of grace. In the Roman Catholic Church the increase of grace received, eternal life, and the winning of a higher glory in that life are subjects of human merit. According to Thomas the three signs of a state of grace are: joy in God, scorn of worldly things, consciousness that one is not guilty of mortal sin.

4. The Lutheran Position.

For Luther the fundamental question was concerning the gracious God, and how one might be justified in the judgment of God. Through a painful experience in the complete renunciation of his own righteousness, he understood the Pauline word —by grace alone through faith in Christ. Justification includes not merely forgiveness, which has precedence, but inner justification. Grace is pardoning mercy, and faith is trust. Christ himself in his person and his historical work is man's righteousness. The law can only increase sin and it demands God's righteous judgment against the sinner. The law must indeed be preached; yet God's proper work begins when he comforts the alarmed conscience by the gospel of forgiveness in Christ. Wherever faith lays hold on Christ and becomes one with him, Christ's righteousness becomes our righteousness; God declares man righteous and forgives his sin. Thus Christ becomes the power of a new life. Later, Luther speaks of a beginning, an advancing, and a completed justification yet to be hoped for. Never could faith by reason of an inner quality be regarded as justifying. The Christian position is grounded in God's gracious judgment. Luther warns against confusing the certainty of salvation with the feeling of it. He combines baptism and justification but without precise theological treatment. Through Melanchthon the doctrine of justification received its first symbolic form (The Augsburg Confession, q.v.). We are righteous before God, not "by our own strength, merits or works," but by faith alone. Justification is grounded in Christ and is mediated by faith alone. In the "Apology" the impelling interest of the Reformation against the Roman doctrine first came to clear expression. In the Formula of Concord all human action is excluded as a condition of the certainty of salvation; justification as distinguished from regeneration is interpreted as forensic, the righteousness of Christ is imputed so that sins are forgiven, and the doctrine of justification is so formulated that nothing whatever in man but simply the historical work of Christ is the true ground of salvation.

5. Later Views.

The later dogmatists distinguished not merely between the human and the divine aspect of the appropriation of Christ's righteousness (Baier), but within faith itself a certainty before, in, and after regeneration (Quenstedt). The certainty of salvation was to be experienced by looking wholly away from self to Christ as the promise. Thus the process of justification was conceived as purely transcendental for which faith is only an essential presupposition. According to Burk, who presents this view, justification is withdrawn from all vacillation of the inner life so that assurance becomes possible to those whose peace has been disturbed. But the question arises as to the criteria of faith. The Lutherans presupposed the universality and promise of Christ's redeeming work; to the Reformed who restricted this to the elect, personal assurance of salvation must be gathered from the works of faith as supernaturally caused. Schleiermacher coordinated justification with conversion; to be taken up into living communion with Christ is, as a changed form of life, conversion, as a changed relation to God, justification. He, however, conceives this as purely general and progressively realized. Some theologians resolve the objective process of justification into subjective consciousness, others emphasize the ethical aspect. Hengstenberg toward the end of his life distinguished stages of justification; according to Beck, in justification mediated through Christ one enters on a condition of life where on the one hand all earlier sins are wiped out, on the other hand a new ethical condition is awakened which must express itself in righteousness of conduct; with Martensen the justifying power of faith lay in God beholding in it the seed-corn of future blessedness, and in the pure will the already realized ideal of freedom. In the so-called Bornholmer movement (see Bornholmers), since the world is justified in Christ, justification is identified with his redemptive work and faith is simply a becoming aware of what one has in Christ.

6. Ritschl and Dorner.

Ritschl combines justification with the historical work of Christ. In Christ the community is so far justified as God reckons to the community belonging to Christ the position which Christ himself maintained toward God, and for his sake admits the community to fellowship with himself. The individual is justified on the ground that through faith in the Gospel he is a member of the community. Justification and reconciliation have the same content. Reconciliation is the result of justification. Ritschl's entire treatment has enduring significance on account of the many problems involved, especially the relation of justification to the historical work of Christ and to faith. Dorner characteristically emphasized the historical deed of reconciliation in relation to the Christian's present position: faith is thus simply "the assimilating organ" of forgiveness already complete so far as the divine aspect is concerned. Justification is identified with reconciliation: the central significance, the express founding, and the certainty of justification on the basis of the historical work of Christ is a peculiar characteristic of Cremer's theology.

1. The Fundamental Position.

III. Doctrinal Discussion: A comprehensive discussion of this subject must be limited to the clear presentation of the controlling interest and the simplest possible designation of the points on which it depends. Communion with God and personal assurance of this stand or fall together. If Christianity is a present personal communion with God, a necessary and radical implication is that it can only be a conscious experience. This being established, one has further to ascertain whether the Christian can be certain of it. There is finally only the alternative, the initiative of communion with God is wholly from God or wholly from man. Whenever the question concerning communion with God wakens in a man, it always occurs at first in his desire to make himself pious, and so to work in fellowship with God. This has its source in the painful consciousness of separation from God in sin; if one recognizes his responsibility for this, it is quite natural for him to establish his own righteousness before God. Yet in all such attempts, on account of their abiding imperfection, one does not escape from inward uncertainty. This has, however, its objective ground: only from God himself can men be admitted to communion with him. It is therefore a more correct understanding when the Catholic view refers the initiative in the entire process of justification definitely to God, and sees the final ground of justification in a justifying act which proceeds from God; this, resulting from suitable preparation and made fruitful in congruous activity, assures one of eternal life. In reality, however, what is here under discussion is such a kind of mediation as brings vividly to consciousness how every attempt to effect reconciliation actually points man after all to his own self-doing, and thrusts him into inner uncertainty. But one can arrive at an actual assurance of a gracious state only when he is clear that this rests solely on God's offer, and that nothing remains for him except in faith to appropriate this divine gift, or rather to let trust in it be begotten in him. God has completed this offer of himself in the work of Christ in which, through an atonement for sin, he has reconciled the world to himself. In so far, then, certainty of salvation is based wholly upon a justice outside ourselves: the righteousness which has been created by Christ's undertaking in man's behalf is the real ground, or, on the ground of his sufferings and death, he now represents man before God. So far, however, as that historical work of Christ reaches man only in the Word and the sacrament therein contained, the Word and the sacrament are the ground of assurance. Later on, these positions will require completion and confirmation.

But they designate the central interest which can not be surrendered; that form of the doctrine of justification can alone be adequate which satisfies this interest.

2. Justification Establishes New Relations with God.

It is now plain in what sense justification as a forensic act is to be understood. If communion with God is established only by him, and if, on the other hand, both on account of the personal nature of this relation of communion and because of the remaining imperfection of the justified, the thought of a magic transformation is excluded, then the justifying act of God on which the Christian position is based can be thought of only in the form of a gracious judgment of God which is not analytic but synthetic. In a word, since the justifying act of God does not first of all contemplate the establishing of a new ethical quality in man, but the founding of a new relation to God, it must be understood not as the confirmation of an ethical quality existing in man, but simply as a judgment of God's gracious will which passes over the sinner and in and with forgiveness of sins justifies and takes him up into communion with God. Even faith, without which there can be no justification, may not, as a meritorious attainment, be made the real ground of justification, nor may the continuance of the state of justification be grounded in part on the life-work of the Christian as a completing of God's act of justification. On the contrary, from beginning to end, the Christian position rests exclusively on God's gracious judgment, so that this, in spite of remaining imperfection, depends solely on affirming the judgment of faith. As a matter of terms, one may question whether God's relation to the sins of the justified person is to be interpreted as daily forgiveness or with older dogmaticians as a continuous justification. According to the former phraseology, the fundamental character of God's justifying act comes indeed to the clearest possible expression, but one may doubt whether the believer can avoid thinking of the daily forgiveness of sins as a constant and radical renewal of his relation to God. In any case, by the acceptance of the notion of a justification continually renewed one is not warranted in supposing that the Christian position is composed of ever new additions. On the contrary, a continuous state of grace is grounded in the original divine act of justification.

If, however, the continuity of this gracious state is due to the historical work of Christ, but originates and is sustained by the gracious judgment of justification, it follows at once that under all circumstances justification and the historical work of Christ must be brought into the closest connection.

3. Conditions of Justification.

But the limits within which this connection is to be sought are designated by the following propositions: (1) justification may not be identified with the historical work of Christ—the Biblical connection between justification and faith would be obscured and the reality of a reciprocal communion of God and man lost. (2) It would be a relapse into the Roman Catholic way of thinking to see in the historical work of Christ only the general ground of possible justification—manifestly the final decisive ground of the divine justifying act of God must then be somehow sought in man himself. If one carries through the combination already suggested in the Biblical presentation, then an adjustment between the apparently divergent interests is possible only when justification is understood as an actual fulfilment of God's offer of himself as completed in the historical work of Christ. Paul does not conceive that the reconciliation in Christ renders the demand "be ye reconciled to God" (II Cor. v. 20) superfluous; rather he sees in the word of reconciliation the necessary accomplishment of reconciliation. On the other hand, he believes that in the Gospel righteousness is disclosed and made efficacious. A combination of these two lines of thought compels one to see that God's historical offer of himself in the work of Christ endures in his Word and so reaches the individual. It is not the fact that God has reopened the way of access to himself in his historical revelation, while man must work his way through to God in reliance on the divine deed; on the contrary, self-disclosure of God in the Word effectively reaches the individual, and wherever through God's offer of grace one lets himself be won to trust in this, the judgment of justification is passed upon him, and this both objectively and subjectively establishes the condition of justification.

The same conclusion follows from the answer to the other question—What position and meaning belong to faith in the act of justification? That faith alone can be regarded as justifying is clear from the foregoing (III., § 1); there it was remarked that the justifying power of faith may not be found in its ethical quality.

4. Relations of Faith and Justification.

If fellowship with God rests solely on Christ's redemptive work and the righteousness procured by it, then faith can be regarded simply as the assimilating organ and as justifying only on account of the object apprehended by it. The peculiar difficulty first emerges in the question, how this understanding of faith which is to be maintained under all circumstances is consistent with the other proposition which must be as firmly emphasized, that only where faith exist is there justification. Does not the latter position indeed involve that somehow on man's part faith appears as an efficient condition of justification? In reality this consequence would be unavoidable if one had to suppose that man—always of course under the influence of the Word—first himself ripens faith in Christ, and then God completes the judgment of justification on the ground of confirming this faith as if it were a finished achievement. The element of truth in such a view is that in fact faith in the strict sense is an offering of Christ to the wrath of God, and precisely for this reason justification comes to pass by means of it. Evidently these propositions which aim to complete the doctrine of justification really point to such a method as will not allow faith to appear in any way as real ground of justification. If, on the other hand, the conclusions just indicated are to be drawn, this means nothing less than that the original interest of the Reformation doctrine would be surrendered. For the Christian would then again be directed to ground his assurance of salvation by reflection upon himself, i.e., on the existence of faith in himself. There would be no place for a simple and radical grounding of certainty on Christ and the Word to which he witnessed. Manifestly that kind of judgment of justification, which amounts to a confirmation of faith already existing in man, can not be thought of as mediated by the Gospel; and again a suggestion of such a judgment of justification could not be presented by means of the Gospel. For the Word, whether it is applied to the individual as a sacramental word or as absolution, can never establish the existence in man of a qualification of justification, but remains simply an active offer of the universal promise. If, therefore, one believes that the reality of the process of justification can be defended only when it is interpreted as confirmation of existing faith, then one must not deceive himself by supposing that a corroboration of such a justifying judgment must be sought in an immediate witness of the Spirit, or won by reflection on the criteria of faith. The Reformed way, on the contrary, which allows the assurance of salvation to be experienced only in the trust springing from the promise, points in another direction—justification is mediated by the Gospel, so that the word of promise becomes itself a justifying judgment wherever it is able to awaken acceptance in man. Thus the position is fully warranted that only where faith exists is there justification, and faith justifies only because it makes Christ avail before God: Christ is indeed the central content of the Word and he it is who is apprehended in the Word. Accordingly justification takes place before God and not in the heart of man—in the strict sense an act of God, and not a conscious process in man. Only in this way is it seriously maintained that every action of God necessarily aims at establishing a present communion with himself. But this is manifestly not attained by a purely transcendent process. Where justification is mediated by the Gospel, the meaning is that this rightly demands trust for and in itself; where man trustfully accepts this, he has what he believes; justification and a state of communion with God is subjectively and objectively realized. One can make this plain to himself in the simplest possible way with reference to absolution. Absolution is not confirmation of a faith existing in man, nor an ineffective announcement of a forgiveness bound to conditions; just as little does it bring forgiveness to all who hear it irrespective of their faith; but being an efficacious offer of forgiveness, it is really forgiveness wherever it is received in faith. Thus understood, justification and certainty concerning it are grounded in faith. This excludes neither a possible nor an actual series of degrees in faith and in certainty; the completion of the divine justification is of significance for faith. Here then the Biblical writers have their place, according to whom, where faith and justification are, there the Holy Spirit who was already active in man for this end becomes for the believer a personal possession in such a way that he witnesses to the existing kinship with God and appears as its seal and pledge. Hence it is possible to apprehend the element of truth in the distinction of faith before and after justification, and in the distinction of justification and confirmation.

5. Justification and Baptism.

The last intimations, if they are to receive concrete form, depend on the answer to a previous question which can not be solved in this article. The foregoing discussion suffers from an unavoidable abstraction in that it can not show whether the original justification is mediated by the Word or by baptism, in the case of children or adults. In fact, manifold difficulties and obscurities beset the treatment of the subject when one does not seriously consider how the general propositions concerning justification are necessarily modified according as they are put to the test in a community of those who were baptized in infancy, or are maintained in the mission field. It is, e.g., plain how the question of the relation of confirmation to justification gains a wholly different meaning when it is put on the basis of child-baptism. Yet these questions can not be settled here because they presuppose the understanding of baptism (see BAPTISM, I.-II.). Only this, however, may be directly inferred from the treatment of the doctrine of the Scripture, that justification and baptism are to be combined. If this is true in the first instance of baptism itself, then it must of necessity apply to child-baptism, if only this is regarded as a real baptism. Here the question concerning the relation of justification and faith takes on a new meaning and raises serious difficulties. For a solution of these a path has already been so far prepared as it was expressly emphasized how faith springs from the divine offer. In any case, one must believe that in the baptism of adults there is a completion both of the divine offer of salvation and, under its influence, of faith, and just in this way the Christian position is both objectively and subjectively established. With reference to the baptism of children, it is to be maintained under all circumstances that even in such cases faith, which affirms baptism, must somehow grow out of baptism. But the question, whether and in what sense one is to connect the origin of faith with baptism, can not here be settled.

6. Conclusion.

The discussion concerning the nature of Christian assurance begun in III., § 1, may now be completed so far as need be in accordance with what has been established in III., §§ 2–5. First then one may formulate the significance of Rom. viii. 16 for the assurance of salvation. If faith in the historical divine revelation, by which the Christian position is created, takes place only by the Holy Spirit, the immanent certainty of the Christian therein given could not maintain itself without the continuous witness of the Spirit. This repudiates the Methodistic view which will experience this witness of the Spirit in an immediate feeling of peace; preferable is the Lutheran view which has the entire economy of salvation on its side as it relates the continuous witness of the Spirit to the historical process of salvation, mediating this by the Word and the sacrament. Yet the strictly supernatural character of that witness may not be lost sight of; in this, as well as in the possession of the Spirit, the Christian has the pledge of his salvation. In the same way may be defined the significance of self-examination for Christian assurance. If the Christian position is connected with faith, the serious Christian can not avoid testing faith and salvation by the criterion of the whole life. On the other hand, it can be of service to one in trouble when faith is hidden from him to become certain of it by means of its criteria. In both of these ways this self-examination is to be conceived as a point of departure. One recognizes the normality of the Christian assurance in its unreflecting appeal to the divine deed which produces the Christian position. All finally comes to this, that the pledge of faith is also the pledge of certainty. If the existing Christian position is assured to faith by historical divine revelation, apparently there is no occasion to go behind that historical revelation to an eternal counsel of God. Yet in reality not merely the Reformed view but also the Formula of Concord makes predestination fruitful for Christian assurance. In fact, recourse to this can not be dispensed with by one who seeks an assurance not simply for the present but also for the future. Only one must add immediately, certainty concerning one's election is to be sought in Christ alone. But wherever the believing Christian, so long as he believes, is certain of the divine election, he knows that his entire salvation, present and future, is in the hand of the eternal God. Two points yet require mention, the brevity of which bears no relation to their significance: (1) in the necessarily personal nature of faith and assurance of salvation one may not forget that these will be experienced in the community of believers in which the Word and the sacrament are in use; and (2) this is in precise analogy to the first—the energy with which, in the matter of the certainty of salvation, the entire life is related to God and to God alone, may not obscure the other truth, that after all man meets God only in the concrete reality of an individual life, and he therefore experiences and maintains the certainty of salvation in the limitless riches of the concrete situations of this life. Only where this is understood does one avoid isolating the witness of the Spirit from the actual life. And now it is possible to make fruitful the profound thought of James, that the Christian is blessed, and that too not by means of his deed but in his deed. (L. H. Ihmels.)

7. Additional Note.

While a majority of critical authorities favor the forensic interpretation of *dikaioun*, "pronouncing righteous," as the only meaning in Paul's writings, there is a not inconsiderable number of scholars who defend the view that it also signifies "making or becoming actually righteous." Among the passages cited to substantiate the latter claim are Rom. iii. 24, 26, 28, 30, vi. 7; Gal. ii. 16, 20, v. 6. That this word is there and in other places used in a real sense is evident from a variety of considerations, such as, the forensic view is inconsistent with an intelligible interpretation of Paul's words referred to above; the real interpretation alone meets the exegetical and rational demands; and in all the passages *dikaiosynē*, "righteousness," is used in the proper sense as the basis of the judgment. Two further arguments for this position are adduced: the principle of character running through the whole of life is one and the same, being that on which the final judgment is based; faith which works by love is the essential principle of righteousness and is accordingly an inward quality of ethical excellence. Even when a forensic judgment is signified by *dikaioun*, this is grounded not in an outside condition but in an actual inner virtue. It does not, like works, make a demand on God, but it constitutes a ground on which one is forgiven who forsakes his sin and identifies himself with Christ. Some of those who hold this general view of *dikaioun* restrict its main reference to the initial moment of conversion, while others extend it to cover the entire period of Christian experience—one is justified according as he is sanctified. Justification may relate to that aspect of the new life in which the person freely and progressively accepts the grace of God in Christ, while sanctification refers to the gradual inner purification of the sources of desire, thought, and will. C. A. B.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the N. T. side consult the works on N. T. theology, especially that of Beyschlag; the literature on the Apostle Paul; R. A. Lipsius, *Die paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre*, Leipsic, 1853; E. Riggenbach, *Die Rechtfertigungslehre des Apostels Paulus*, Stuttgart, 1897; H. Cremer, *Die paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre*, Gütersloh, 1900; K. F. Nösgen, *Der Schriftbeweis für die evangelische Rechtfertigungslehre*, Halle, 1901; C. Clemen, *Paulus, sein Leben und Wirken*, 2 vols., Giessen, 1904; C. E. Woods, *The Gospel of Rightness. A Study in Pauline Philosophy*, London, 1909.

On the dogmatic and historical sides consult: G. S. Faber, *The Primitive Doctrine of Justification*, London, 1839; G. Bull, *Harmony of St. Paul and St. James on Justification*, 2 vols., in *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, Oxford, 1841 sqq.; C. A. Heurtley, *Justification*, ib. 1846; G. Junkin, *A Treatise on Justification*, Philadelphia, 1850; P. D. Burk, *Rechtfertigung und Versicherung*, Stuttgart, 1854; C. Cholmondely, *The Protestant Doctrine of Justification . . . Confuted*, London, 1854; J. Buchanan, *The Doctrine of Justification*, Edinburgh, 1867; A. Ritschl, *Critical Hist. of the Christian Doctrines of Justification and Reconciliation*, ib. 1872; C. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, iii. 114 sqq., New York, 1873; R. N. Davies, *A Treatise on Justification*, New York, 1878; I. A. Dorner, *System of Christian Doctrine*, passim, 4 vols., Edinburgh, 1880–82; J. H. Newman, *Lectures on the Doctrine of Justification*, London, 1885; J. T. Beck, *Vorlesungen über christliche Glaubenslehre*, 2 vols., Gütersloh, 1886–87; T. R. Birks, *Justification and Imputed Righteousness*, ib. 1887; J. T. O'Brien, *An Attempt to Explain and Establish the Doctrine of Justification by Faith only*, Dublin, 1887; W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, ii. 538 sqq., New York, 1888; H. B. Smith, *System of Christian Theology*, ed. W. S. Karr, pp. 522–552, ib. 1890; H. Bushnell, *Vicarious Sacrifice*, ii. 177 sqq., ib. 1891; E. V. Gerhart, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ii. 717–759, ib. 1894; J. Miley, *Systematic Theology*, ii. 308 sqq., ib. 1894; R. V. Foster, *Systematic Theology*, pp. 678 sqq., Nashville, Tenn., 1898; J. Macpherson, *Christian Dogmatics*, pp. 379–387, Edinburgh, 1898; J. Wilhelm and T. B. Scannell, *Manual of Catholic Theology*, ii. 246 sqq., London, 1901; H. W. Holden, *Justification by Faith*, ib. 1902; A. H. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, pp. 471–483, New York, 1902; H. C. G. Moule, *Justification by Faith*, London, 1903; the literature on Luther, and in general the works on the history of doctrine.

JUSTIN: A Gnostic writer refuted by Hippolytus (*Haer.*, v. 18–22, x. 11; *ANF*, v. 69–73, 145). According to him there are three principles in the universe, two male—the Good and the Father of all things, also called Elohim—and one female, called Eden and Israel, who had the form of a snake from her waist downward. From the intercourse of Elohim and Eden arose twelve paternal and twelve maternal angels; through whose mediation men were formed from the noble parts of Eden, and from the ignoble parts animals. Men were provided with a soul by Eden and with a spirit by Elohim. Eden was deserted by Elohim, who went aloft to sit at the right hand of the Good. Eden now filled the world with sin and evil, and fought with Elohim, having the maternal angels on her side. Elohim sent Baruch, the third paternal angel, to aid the spirit of man which had been overcome by Naas, " the serpent," the third maternal angel. Baruch found Hercules who performed his twelve labors against Eden, but at last was overcome by Eden by means of Omphale. Finally Baruch found Jesus who withstood the serpent, which brought about his crucifixion, when his spirit returned to Elohim, but his body and soul to Eden. The initiated, who faithfully keep the oath of Elohim to keep the mysteries and not to turn from the Good to the creature, enter into the Good and drink of the water of life. To understand more fully the relation of Justin to the other Gnostics see OPHITES. (G. KRÜGER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. Möller, *Geschichte der Kosmologie in der griechischen Kirche*, pp. 241–248, Halle, 1860; A. Hilgenfeld, in *ZWT*, v (1862), 446–452; idem, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, pp. 64, 67, 270, 277, Leipsic, 1884; G. Salmon, in *DCB*, iii. 587–589; idem, in *Hermathena*, xi (1885), 389–402; H. Stähelin, in *TU*, vi. 3 (1891).

JUSTIN MARTYR.

Life and Writings (§ 1).
The " Apology " (§ 2).
The " Dialogue " and " Resurrection " (§ 3).
Justin's Theology (§ 4).
His Conversion and Teachings (§ 5).
His Doctrine of the Logos (§ 6).

1. Life and Writings.

[The facts of the life of Justin Martyr, the famous Christian apologist of the second century, so far as they are known, are gathered chiefly from his own writings. He was born at Flavia Neapolis (the ancient Shechem and modern Nablus) in Palestine probably about 114. He suffered martyrdom at Rome under Marcus Aurelius when Rusticus was prefect of the city (i.e., between 162 and 168). He calls himself a Samaritan, but his father and grandfather were doubtless Greek or Roman, and he was brought up in heathen customs. It seems that he had property, studied philosophy diligently, became converted to Christianity (see below, § 5), and thenceforth devoted his life to teaching what he considered the true philosophy, still wearing his philosopher's gown to indicate that he had attained to the truth. He probably traveled widely and ultimately settled in Rome as a Christian teacher.] The earliest mention of Justin is found in Tatian (*Oratio ad Graecos*, xviii., xix.), who calls him " the most admirable Justin," quotes a saying of his, and says that the Cynic Crescens laid snares for him. Irenaeus (*Haer.* I., xxviii. 1) speaks of his martyrdom, and of Tatian as his disciple; he quotes him twice (IV., vi. 2, V., xxvi. 2), and shows his influence in other places. Tertullian (*Adversus Valentinianos*, v.) calls him a philosopher and martyr, and the earliest antagonist of heretics. Hippolytus and Methodius also mention or quote him. Eusebius deals with him at some length (*Hist. eccl.*, iv. 18), and names the following works: (1) The " Apology " addressed to Antoninus Pius, his sons, and the senate; (2) a second " Apology " addressed to Marcus Aurelius and Verus; (3) the " Discourse to the Greeks," a discussion with Greek philosophers on the character of their gods; (4) a " Hortatory Address to the Greeks "; (5) a treatise " On the Sovereignty of God," in which he makes use of pagan authorities as well as Christian; (6) a work entitled " The Psalmist "; (7) a treatise in scholastic form " On the Soul "; (8) the " Dialogue with Trypho." He implies that a number of other works were in circulation; from Irenaeus he knows of the apology " Against Marcion," and from Justin's " Apology " (i. 26) of a " Refutation of all Heresies " (*Hist. eccl.*, IV., xi. 10). Epiphanius (*Haer.*, xlvi. 1) and Jerome (*De vir. ill.*, ix.) mention Justin. Rufinus borrows from him the Latin original of Hadrian's letter. After Rufinus Justin was not known in the West for a long time, and the Eastern writers got their knowledge of him mainly from Irenaeus and Eusebius, or from spurious works. The *Chronicon Paschale* is possibly independent in assigning his martyrdom to the year 165. A considerable number of other works are given as Justin's by Arethas, Photius, and other writers; but their spuriousness is now generally admitted. The *Expositio rectae fidei* has been assigned by Dräseke to Apollinaris of Laodicea, but it is probably a work of as late as the sixth century. The *Cohortatio ad Graecos* has been attributed to Apollinaris of Laodicea, Apollinaris of Hierapolis, and others. The *Epistola ad Zenam et Serenum*, an exhortation to Christian living, is dependent upon Clement of Alexandria, and is assigned by Batiffol to the Novatian Bishop Sisinnius (c. 400). The extant work under the title " On the Sovereignty of God " does not correspond with Eusebius' description of it, though Harnack regards it as still possibly Justin's, and at least of the second century. The author of the smaller treatise " To the Greeks " can not be Justin, because he is dependent on Tatian; Harnack places it between 180 and 240. For another work wrongly attributed to Justin, see DIOGNETUS, EPISTLE TO.

On the other hand, the authenticity of the two " Apologies " and the " Dialogue with Trypho " is universally admitted. They are preserved only in the *Sacra parallela;* but, besides that they were known by Tatian, Methodius, and Eusebius, their influence is traceable in Athenagoras, Theophilus, the pseudo-Melito, and especially Tertullian. Eusebius speaks of two " Apologies," but he quotes them both as one, which indeed they are in substance. The identity of authorship is shown not only by the reference in the " Dialogue," cxx., to the " Apology," but by the unity of treatment. Zahn has shown that the " Dialogue " was originally divided into two books, that there is a considerable lacuna at chap. lxxiv., as well as at the beginning, and that it is probably based on an actual occurrence at Ephesus, the personality of the Rabbi Tarphon being employed, though in a Hellenized form. The treatise "On the Resurrection," of which extensive fragments are preserved in the *Sacra parallela*, is not so generally accepted. Even earlier than this collection, it is referred to by Procopius of Gaza (c. 465–528), and Methodius appeals to Justin in support of his interpretation of I Cor. xv. 50 in a way which makes it natural to assume the existence of a treatise on the subject, to say nothing of other traces of a connection in thought both here, in Irenaeus (V., ii.–xiii. 5), and also in Tertullian, where it is too close to be anything but a conscious following of the Greek. The "Against Marcion" is lost, as is the "Refutation of all Heresies" to which Justin himself refers in "Apology," i. 26; Hegesippus, besides perhaps Irenaeus and Tertullian, seems to have used it.

2. The "Apology."

Of the date of the "Dialogue" it can only be said that it was later than the "Apology"; the time of composition of the latter, however, can be determined with comparative closeness. From the fact that it was addressed to Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, and Verus, its composition must fall between 147 and 161. The reference to Felix as governor of Egypt, since this can only be the Lucius Munatius Felix whom the Oxyrhynchus papyri give as prefect Sept. 13, 151, fixes the date still more exactly. Its occasion is evidently a recent occurrence, and the *Chronicon* of Eusebius gives 152–153 as the date of the attacks of Crescens. What is designated as the "Second Apology" was written as a supplement to the first, on account of certain proceedings which had in the mean time taken place in Rome before Lollius Urbicus as prefect of the city, which must have been between 150 and 157.

The purpose of the "Apology" is to prove to the emperors, renowned as upright and philosophical men, the injustice of the persecution of the Christians, who are really the representatives of true philosophy. Chaps. i.–xii. give the preliminary negative proof; chap. xiii. begins a positive exposition of what Christianity really is. Christians are the true worshipers of God, the Creator of all things; they offer him the only sacrifices worthy of him, those of prayer and thanksgiving, and are taught by his Son, to whom they assign a place next in honor to him. This teaching leads them to perfect morality, as shown in their teacher's words and their own lives, and founded on their belief in the resurrection. The doctrine of the Logos made flesh is specially emphasized in xxi., xxii. What interferes with belief in this fact is the deceitful work of demons (xxiii.–xxvi.), in contrast with which Christian righteousness is still further described (xxvii.–xxix.). Then follows the proof that Christ is the Son of God from Old-Testament prophecy, fulfilled in every detail (xxx.–l.), no matter what evil spirits may pretend (liv.–lvii.); even Plato learned from Moses (lviii.–lx.). The remaining chapters (lxi.–lxvii.) give a glimpse of the daily life of Christians at the time—baptism, communion, and Sunday worship. The supplementary or "Second Apology" depicts the behavior of the Christians under persecution, of which the demons are again set forth as the instigators.

3. The "Dialogue" and "Resurrection."

In the "Dialogue," after an introductory section (i.–ix.), Justin undertakes to show that Christianity is the new law for all men (x.–xxx.), and to prove from Scripture that Jesus is the Christ (xxxi.–cviii.). The concluding section (cix.–cxlii.) demonstrates that the Christians are the true people of God. The fragments of the work "On the Resurrection" begin with the assertion that the truth, and God the author of truth, need no witness, but that as a concession to the weakness of men it is necessary to give arguments to convince those who gainsay it. It is then shown, after a denial of unfounded deductions, that the resurrection of the body is neither impossible nor unworthy of God, and that the evidence of prophecy is not lacking for it. Another fragment takes up the positive proof of the resurrection, adducing that of Christ and of those whom he recalled to life. In another the resurrection is shown to be that of what has gone down, i.e., the body; the knowledge concerning it is the new doctrine in contrast with that of the old philosophers; the doctrine follows from the command to keep the body in moral purity.

4. Justin's Theology.

Flacius discovered "blemishes" in Justin's theology, which he attributed to the influence of pagan philosophers; and in modern times Semler and S. G. Lange have made him out a thorough Hellene, while Semisch and Otto defend him from this charge. In opposition to the school of Baur, who considered him a Jewish Christian, A. Ritschl has pointed out that it was precisely because he was a Gentile Christian that he did not fully understand the Old-Testament foundation of Paul's teaching, and explained in this way the modified character of his Paulinism and his legal mode of thought. M. von Engelhardt has attempted to extend this line of treatment to Justin's entire theology, and to show that his conceptions of God, of free will and righteousness, of redemption, grace, and merit prove the influence of the cultivated Greek pagan world of the second century, dominated by the Platonic and Stoic philosophy. But he admits that Justin is a Christian in his unquestioning adherence to the Church and its faith, his unqualified recognition of the Old Testament, and his faith in Christ as the Son of God the Creator, made manifest in the flesh, crucified, and risen, through which belief he succeeds in getting away from the dualism of pagan and also of Gnostic philosophy.

5. His Conversion and Teachings.

In the opening of the "Dialogue," Justin relates his vain search among the Stoics, Peripatetics, and Pythagoreans for a satisfying knowledge of God; his finding in the ideas of Plato wings for his soul, by the aid of which he hoped to attain the contemplation of the Godhead; and his meeting on the seashore with an aged man who told him that by no human endeavor but only by divine revelation could this blessedness be attained, that the prophets had conveyed this revelation to man, and that their words had been fulfilled. Of the truth of this he assured himself by his own investigation; and the daily life of the Christians and the courage of the martyrs convinced him that the charges against them were unfounded. So he sought to spread the knowledge of Christianity as the true philosophy. He had, like others, the idea that the Greek philosophers had derived, if not borrowed, the most essential elements of truth found in their teaching from the Old Testament. But at the same time he adopted the Stoic doctrine of the "seminal word," and so philosophy was to him an operation of the Word—in fact, through his identification of the Word with Christ, it was brought into immediate connection with him. Thus he does not scruple to declare that Socrates and Heraclitus were Christians (*Apol.*, i. 46, ii. 10). His aim, of course, is to emphasize the absolute significance of Christ, so that all that ever existed of virtue and truth may be referred to him. The old philosophers and lawgivers had only a part of the Logos, while the whole appears in Christ. While the heathen, seduced by demons, had deserted the true God for idols, the Jews and Samaritans possessed the revelation given through the prophets and awaited the Messiah. The law, however, while containing commandments intended to promote the true fear of God, had other prescriptions of a purely pedagogic nature, which necessarily ceased when Christ, their end, appeared; of such temporary and merely relative regulations were circumcision, animal sacrifices, the Sabbath, and the laws as to food. Through Christ the abiding law of God has been fully proclaimed. In his character as the teacher of the new doctrine and promulgator of the new law lies the essential nature of his redeeming work. The idea of an economy of grace, of a restoration of the union with God which had been destroyed by sin, is not foreign to him. It is noteworthy that in the "Dialogue" he no longer speaks of a "seed of the Word" in every man, and in his non-apologetic works the emphasis is laid upon the redeeming acts of the life of Christ rather than upon the demonstration of the reasonableness and moral value of Christianity, though the fragmentary character of the latter works makes it difficult to determine exactly to what extent this is true and how far the teaching of Irenaeus on redemption is derived from him. Still, it is safe to say that Justin's theology is characterized throughout by an ethical strain. Faith does not justify but is a preliminary to justification, which is accomplished by repentance, change of heart, and a sinless life according to God's commandments. Baptism confers the remission only of previous sins; the Christian must thereafter show himself worthy of union with God by a life without sin. In the Eucharist he shows his devotion by offering bread and wine and by prayer, receiving in return the food consecrated by a formula of Christ's institution, which is the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus, and by which our flesh and blood are nourished through a kind of transformation (*kata metabolēn*).

Justin is confident that his teaching is that of the Church at large. He knows of a division among the orthodox only on the question of the millennium and on the attitude toward the milder Jewish Christianity, which he personally is willing to tolerate as long as its professors in their turn do not interfere with the liberty of the Gentile converts; his millenarianism seems to have no connection with Judaism, but he believes firmly in a millennium, and generally in the primitive Christian eschatology.

6. His Doctrine of the Logos.

His use of the idea of the Logos has always attracted attention. It is probably too much to assume a direct connection with Philo in this particular. The idea of the Logos was widely familiar to educated men, and the designation of the Son of God as the Logos was not new to Christian theology. The significance is clear, however, of the manner in which Justin identifies the historical Christ with the rational force operative in the universe, which leads up to the claim of all truth and virtue for the Christians and to the demonstration of the adoration of Christ, which aroused so much opposition, as the only reasonable attitude. It is mainly for this justification of the worship of Christ that Justin employs the Logos-idea, though where he explicitly deals with the divinity of the Redeemer and his relation to the Father, he makes use of the Old Testament, not of the Logos-idea, which thus can not be said to form an essential part of his Christology.

The importance which he attaches to the evidence of prophecy shows his estimate of the Old-Testament Scriptures, which are to Christians absolutely the word of God, spoken by the Holy Ghost, and confirmed by the fulfilment of the prophecies. Not less divine, however, is the teaching of the apostles, which is read in the assembly every Lord's Day—though he can not use this in his "Dialogue" as he uses the Old Testament. The word of the apostles is the teaching of the Divine Logos, and reproduces the sayings of Christ authentically. As a rule he uses the synoptic Gospels, but has a few unmistakable references to John. He quotes the Apocalypse as inspired because prophetic, naming its author. The opposition of Marcion prepares us for an attitude toward the Pauline epistles corresponding to that of the later Church. Distinct references are found to Romans, I Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, and II Thessalonians, and possible ones to Philippians, Titus, and I Timothy. It seems likely that he also knew Hebrews and I John. The apologetic character of Justin's habit of thought appears again in the Acts of his martyrdom (*ASB*, Apr., ii. 108 sqq.; Ruinart, *Acta martyrum*, Regensburg, 1859, 105 sqq.), the genuineness of which is attested by internal evidence. (N. Bonwetsch.)

Bibliography: Lists of literature are given in *ANF*, Bibliography, pp. 21–26, and in J. M. Baldwin, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, iii. 1, pp. 285–286. The best edition of the *Opera* is by J. C. T. Otto, 2 vols., Jena, 1843, reproduced by W. Trollope, 3 vols., London, 1845–1847, and in *Corpus apologetarum Christianorum*, 3 vols., Jena, 1876–81, and in *MPG*, vi. 227–800, 1571–1600, cf. 1181–1564. The *editio princeps* was by R. Stephanus, Paris, 1551 (Greek), followed by one by F. Sylburg, Heidelberg, 1593 and often (Greek and Latin); and that by P. Maranus, Paris, 1742 (the best before Otto, critical). There have been many editions of the single works. The best Eng.

translations are in the *Library of the Fathers*, ed. E. B. Pusey, J. Keble, and J. H. Newman, Oxford, 1861, and in *ANF*, i. 163–302.

On the life and works of Justin consult: K. Semisch, *Justin der Märtyrer*, 2 vols., Breslau, 1840–42, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1844; idem, *Die apostolischen Denkwürdigkeiten des Märtyrers Justinus*, Hamburg, 1848; J. C. T. von Otto, *De Justini Martyris scriptis et doctrina*, Jena, 1841; A. Hilgenfeld, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justins*, Halle, 1850; J. Kaye, *Some Account of the Life and Writings of Justin Martyr*, Cambridge, 1853; G. Volkmar, *Ueber Justin . . . und sein Verhältniss zu unsern Evangelien*, Zurich, 1853; C. G. Seibert, *Justinus der Vertheidiger des Christenthums vor dem Thron der Caesaren*, Elberfeld, 1859; C. E. Freppel, *Les Apologistes chrétiens au II. siècle; S. Justin*, Paris, 1860; W. Möller, *Die Kosmologie in der griechischen Kirche bis auf Origenes*, pp. 112–188, Halle, 1860; D. H. de Puiseau, *De Christologie van Justin Martyr*, Leyden, 1864; J. Donaldson, *Critical Hist. of Christian Literature and Doctrine*, ii. 62–344, London, 1866; L. Aubé, *S. Justin, philosophe et martyr*, Paris, 1875; J. Drummond, in *Theological Review*, xii (1875), 471 sqq., xiv (1877), 155 sqq., xvi (1879), 360 sqq.; [W. R. Cassel,] *Supernatural Religion*, i. 283–428, ii. 271–316, iii. 15–17, London, 1875 (brilliant but criticized as rationalistic); B. F. Westcott, *Hist. of the Canon of the N. T.*, pp. 59–177, ib. 1875; M. von Engelhardt, *Das Christentum Justins des Märtyrers*, Erlangen, 1878 (reviews previous discussions); A. Stählin, *Justin der Märtyrer und sein neuester Beurtheiler*, Leipsic, 1880 (opposes Engelhardt); T. Zahn in *ZKG*, viii (1885), 1–84; F. W. Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers*, i. 93–117, New York, 1889; G. T. Purves, *The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity*, ib. 1889; Mrs. M. E. Martin, *Life of Justin Martyr*, London, 1890; W. Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, ii. 682–687, ib. 1890; C. Clemen, *Die religionsphilosophische Bedeutung des stoisch-christlichen Eudamonismus in Justin's Apologie*, Leipsic, 1891; E. Huth, *Justin Martyr*, Paris, 1894; L. Waterman, *The Post-Apostolic Age*, pp. 141–156 et passim, New York, 1898; *S. Justin et les apologistes du 2. siècle*, Paris, 1907; A. L. Feder, *Justin des Märtyrers Lehre von Jesus Christus*, Freiburg, 1908; W. Walker, *Greatest Men of the Christian Church*, Chicago, 1908; Krüger, *History*, pp. 105–117; Harnack, *Litteratur*, passim, consult Index; idem, *Dogma*, vols. i.–iv., passim; idem in *TU*, i. 130–195, Leipsic, 1882; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, i. 408–448; Neander, *Christian Church*, i. 661–771 et passim; Schaff, *Christian Church*, ii. 710–726 et passim; Moeller, *Christian Church*, i, 172–175; *DCB*, iii. 560–587 (should not be overlooked). The subject is treated at greater or less length in the works on the church history of the period, one phase appears in the discussions on the Fourth Gospel, another in the treatises on the History of Doctrine, while the works on the Introduction to the N. T. are also to be consulted.

JUSTINIAN I., EMPEROR OF THE EAST.

Life (§ 1).
Religious Policy (§ 2).
Ecclesiastical Policy (§ 3).
Relations with Rome (§ 4).
Writings (§ 5).

1. Life.

Flavius Anicius Julianus Justinianus was born, probably May 11, 483, at Tauresium (120 m. n.w. of Saloniki); d. at Constantinople Nov. 13 [14], 565. Coming to Constantinople during his youth, he completed the usual course of education, busying himself mainly with jurisprudence and philosophy. His mother being a sister to the highly esteemed General Justin, Justinian's military career was one of rapid advancement, and a great future was opened up for him when, in 518, Justin assumed the government. Consul in 521, later in command of the army of the east, he was virtual regent a long time before Justin made him associate emperor, on Apr. 1, 527. Four months later he became the sole sovereign. His administration was of world-wide moment, constituting a distinct epoch in the history of the Byzantine Empire and the Eastern Church. He was a man of unusual capacity for work, temperate, affable, lively; but also unscrupulous, and crafty. He was the last of the emperors who attempted to restore the Roman Empire to its former glory. For this end were his great wars and his colossal activity in building directed. Starting from the premise that the existence of a commonwealth rested upon arms and laws, he paid particular attention to legislation, and wrought a lasting memorial for himself by codifying the Roman law (*Codex Justinianus, Novellae Constitutiones*). In this article, however, there will be considered only his participation in religious and ecclesiastical movements, by means of statecraft and legislation.

2. Religious Policy.

Justinian's religious policy was upheld by the imperial conviction that the unity of the empire unconditionally presupposed unity of faith; and with him it was a matter of course that this faith could be only the orthodox. Those of a different belief had to recognize that the process which had been begun by imperial legislation from Constantius down was now to be vigorously continued. The Codex contained two statutes (*Cod.*, I., xi. 9 and 10) which decreed the total destruction of Hellenism, even in the civil life; nor were the appertaining provisions to stand merely on paper. The sources (Malalas, Theophanes, John of Ephesus) tell of severe persecutions, even of men in high positions. But what proved of universal historic account, was the ruling whereby the emperor, in 529, abrogated philosophical and juridical instruction at the University of Athens, thus putting an end to this training-school for Hellenism. And the Christian propaganda went hand in hand with the suppression of paganism. In Asia Minor alone, John of Ephesus claimed to have converted 70,000 pagans (cf. F. Nau, in *Revue de l'orient chrétien*, ii., 1897, 482). Christianity was also accepted by the Heruli (Procopius, *Bellum Gothicum*, ii. 14; Evagrius, *Hist. eccl.*, iv. 20), the Huns dwelling near the Don (Procopius, iv. 4; Evagrius, iv. 23), the Abasgi (Procopius, iv. 3; Evagrius, iv. 22) and the Tzani (Procopius, *Bellum Persicum*, i. 15) in Caucasia. The worship of Ammon at Augila in the Libyan desert (Procopius, *De Aedificiis*, vi. 2) was abolished; and so were the remnants of the worship of Isis on the island of Philae, at the first cataract of the Nile (Procopius, *Bellum Persicum*, i. 19). The Presbyter Julian (*DCB*, iii. 482) and the Bishop Longinus (John of Ephesus, *Hist. eccl.*, iv. 5 sqq.) conducted a mission among the Nabatæans, and Justinian attempted to strengthen Christianity in Yeman by despatching thither an ecclesiastic of Egypt (Procopius, *Bellum Persicum*, i. 20; Malalas, ed. Niebuhr, Bonn, 1831, pp. 433 sqq.). The Jews, too, had to suffer; for not only were their civil rights restricted (*Cod.*, I., v. 12), and their religious privileges threatened (Procopius, *Historia Arcana*, 28); but the emperor interfered too in the internal affairs of the synagogue (*Nov.*, cxlvi., Feb. 8, 553), and forbade, for instance, the use of the Hebrew language in divine worship. The recalcitrant were menaced with corporal penalties, exile and loss of property. The Jews at Borium, not far from Syrtis Major, who resisted Belisarius in his Vandal campaign, had to embrace Christianity; and their synagogue was changed into a church (Procopius, *De Aedificiis*, vi. 2). The emperor had much trouble with the Samaritans; refractory to Christianity, as they were, and repeatedly in insurrection. He opposed them with rigorous edicts, but yet could not prevent a fresh outbreak against the Christians from taking place in Samaria toward the close of his reign. It was no less consistent with his policy, that the Manicheans, too, were persecuted severely, both with exile and threat of capital punishment (*Cod.*, I., v. 12). At Constantinople, on one occasion, not a few Manicheans, after strict inquisition, were executed in the emperor's very presence: some by burning, others by drowning (F. Nau, in *Revue de l'orient*, ii., 1897, p. 481).

3. Ecclesiastical Policy.

The like despotism was also shown in the emperor's ecclesiastical policy. He regulated everything, both in religion and in law. At the very beginning of his reign, he deemed it proper to promulgate by law his belief in the Trinity and the incarnation; and to threaten all heretics with the becoming penalties (*Cod.*, I., i. 5); whereas he subsequently declared that he designed to deprive all disturbers of orthodoxy of the opportunity for such offense by due process of law (*MPG*, lxxxvi. 1, p. 993). He made the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan creed the sole symbol of the Church (*Cod.*, I., i. 7), and accorded legal force to the canons of the four ecumenical councils (*Novellae*, cxxxi.). The bishops in attendance at the Synod of Constantinople in 536 recognized that nothing could be done in the Church contrary to the emperor's will and command (Mansi, *Concilia*, viii. 970B); while, on his side, the emperor, in the case of the Patriarch Anthimus, reinforced the ban of the Church with temporal proscription (*Novellae*, xlii.). Bishops without number had to feel the tyrant's wrath. On the other hand, it is true, he neglected no opportunity for securing the rights of the Church and clergy, for protecting and extending monasticism. Indeed, were not the despotic character of his measures so glaring, one might be tempted to call him a father of the Church. Both the Codex and the Novellae contain many enactments regarding donations, foundations, and administration of ecclesiastical property; election and rights of bishops, priests and abbots; monastic life, residential obligations of the clergy, conduct of divine service, episcopal jurisdiction, etc.

4. Relations with Rome.

From the middle of the fifth century onward increasingly arduous tasks confronted the emperors of the East in the province of ecclesiastical polity. For one thing, the radicals on all sides felt themselves constantly repelled by the creed which had been adopted by the Council of Chalcedon with the design of mediating between the dogmatic parties. The letter of Leo I. to Flavian of Constantinople passed far and wide, in the East, for a document of Satan; so that, where such was the case, nobody cared to hear aught of the Church of Rome. The emperors, however, had to wrestle with a twofold problem. In the first place, the unity between East and West, between Byzantium and Rome, was to be preserved; and this was possible only if they swerved not from the line defined at Chalcedon. In the next place, the factions in the East which had been stirred up and disaffected on account of Chalcedon must be restrained and pacified. This problem was the more difficult because the dissenting groups in the East excelled the party for Chalcedon in the East both in numerical strength and in intellectual ability; and so the course of events showed the two aims to be incompatible: whoever chose Rome and the West must renounce the East, and *vice versa.* For the progress of affairs under Zeno and Anastasius see MONOPHYSITES. Justinian entered the arena of ecclesiastical statecraft shortly after his uncle's accession in 518, and put an end to the schism that had prevailed between Rome and Byzantium since 483. The recognition of the Roman see as the highest ecclesiastical authority (cf. *Novellae*, cxxxi.) remained the cornerstone of his policy in relation to the West, although he thus grievously offended those of the East, and though he felt himself entirely free to show a despotic front toward the pope (witness his behavior toward Silverius and Vigilius). But the controversies in the East were alone sufficient to keep the emperor busy all through his reign; and he plainly paid much more attention to them than to the external affairs of the realm. Yet his policy bore marks of greatness, and strove with large understanding to satisfy the religious instincts of the devout in the East, a signal proof of which was his attitude in the Theopaschite controversy (see THEOPASCHITES). At the outset he was of the opinion that the question turned on a quibble of words. By degrees, however, he came to understand that the formula at issue was not only orthodox, but might also be used as a conciliatory measure toward the Monophysites, and made a vain attempt to do this in the religious conference with the Severians, in 533. Again, he reviewed the same approvingly in the religious edict of Mar. 15, 533 (*Cod.*, I., i. 6), and congratulated himself that Pope John II. admitted the orthodoxy of the imperial confession (*Cod.*, I., i. 8). The serious blunder that he had made at the beginning by abetting after Justin's accession a severe persecution of the Monophysite bishops and monks and thereby embittering the population of vast regions and provinces, he remedied eventually. His constant aim now was to win the Monophysites, yet not to surrender the Chalcedonian faith. For many at court, he did not go far enough: the Empress Theodora especially would have been glad to see the Monophysites favored unreservedly. Justinian, however, was restrained in that policy by the complications that would have ensued with the West. Neither, for that matter, could he escape these issues; for instance, the Three Chapter Controversy (q.v.; see also VIGILIUS). In the condemnation of the Three Chapters Justinian tried to satisfy both the East and the West, but succeeded in satisfying neither. Although the pope assented to the condemnation, the West believed that the emperor was acting contrary to the decrees of Chalcedon; and though many delegates were found in the East subservient to Justinian, yet there were many, especially the Monophysites, left unsatisfied. So the emperor's efforts were wasted on an impossible task; the more bitter for him because during his last years he took greater interest in theological matters.

5. Writings.

It can not be doubted that Justinian also took an actual, personal hand in the theological manifestoes which he put forth as emperor; although, in view of the author's exalted position, it is a difficult matter to ascertain whether the documents current under his name are the direct product of his pen. Apart from letters to the Popes Hormisdas, John II., Agapetus I., and Vigilius, and sundry other compositions (collected in *MPL*, lxiii., lxvi. and lxix.), the following documents may be noted (all to be found in *MPG*, lxxxvi. 1, pp. 945–1152): (1) the edict on Origen's heterodoxies, in 543 or 544; (2) summons to the bishops assembled at Constantinople on occasion of the council of 553, with reference to their sitting in judgment on errors in circulation among the monastic followers of Origen at Jerusalem; (3) an edict on the Three Chapters, probably framed in 551; (4) an address to the council of 553, concerning the Antiochian theology; (5) a document probably antedating 550, addressed to some unnamed defenders (perhaps Scythians) of the Three Chapters; (6) writ of excommunication against Anthimus, Severus and companions; (7) an address to some Egyptian monks, with a refutation of Monophysite errors; (8) fragment of a document, mentioned in (7), to the Patriarch Zoilus of Alexandria. The theology upheld in these writings agreed, in general, with that of Leontius of Byzantium (q.v.); that is, it aims at the final solution of the problem by interpreting the Chalcedonian symbol in terms of the theology of Cyril of Alexandria. Two points are worth noting in this connection. First, the clever way in which the emperor, or his representative, contrives to defend the reputation and the theology of Cyril; secondly, his antagonism to Origen: a clear sign of the characteristic disinclination of that age for independent thinking; at least among personages of weight and influence. A word or two should be subjoined on the subject of Aphthartodocetism; a doctrine professed by the emperor toward the close of his life. Evagrius reports (*Hist. eccl.*, iv. 39), and other sources confirm the point, that Justinian promulgated an edict in which he declared Christ's body to be incorruptible and not susceptible to natural suffering, and commanded bishops everywhere to accept this doctrine. The fall of the Patriarch Eutychius (q.v.) is associated with this final phase of the imperial policy. The sources saw a lamentable decline from the right faith in Justinian's latter conduct. The train of thought underlying Aphthartodocetism, however, is not necessarily unorthodox (see JULIAN OF HALICARNASSUS); because it need not be opposed to the acceptance of the essential identity of Christ's nature with human nature. Hence it is not necessary to regard Justinian's final theological views as those of an old man, to be disregarded in surveying the aims of his full-bodied activity. G. KRÜGER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chaps. xl.–xliv.; C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien*, vols. vi.–viii., Leipsic, 1773–78; J. B. Bury, *Hist. of the Later Roman Empire*, 2 vols., London, 1889; A. Knecht, *Die Religionspolitik Kaiser Justinians I.*, Würzburg, 1896; idem, *System des justinianischen Kirchenvermögensrechtes*, Stuttgart, 1905; W. H. Hutton, *The Church of the Sixth Century*, London, 1897; C. Diehl, *Justinien et la culture byzantine*, Paris, 1901; G. Pfannmüller, *Die kirchliche Gesetzgebung Justinians*, Berlin, 1902; W. Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz*, ib. 1903; J. Pargoire, *L'Église byzantine, 527–847*, Paris, 1905; W. G. Holmes, *The Age of Justinian and Theodora*, 2 vols., London, 1905–07; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. ii., Eng. transl., vol. iv.; *DCB*, iii. 538–559 (elaborate discussion); Neander, *Christian Church*, vol. iii. passim; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 768 sqq. et passim; the literature under the articles referred to in the text. Consult further: F. A. Biener, *Geschichte der Novellen Justinians*, Berlin, 1824; J. Cauvet, *L'Empereur Justinien et son œuvre législative*, Caen, 1880.

JUSTUS: First bishop of Rochester and fourth archbishop of Canterbury; d. at Canterbury Nov. 10, 627. He was sent to England with Mellitus (q.v.) and others in 601. Augustine (q.v.) consecrated him bishop for West Kent in 604 and Ethelbert, king of Kent, built him a church at Rochester. In 617 during the heathen reaction under Eadbald, with Mellitus he fled into Gaul, but was recalled after a year and restored to his bishopric (see LAURENCE OF CANTERBURY; MELLITUS). He succeeded Mellitus as archbishop in 624, consecrated Romanus as his successor at Rochester, and sent Paulinus (q.v.) to Northumbria. He received the pallium from Boniface V.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bede, *Hist. eccl.*, i. 29, ii. 3, 4, 8, 18; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 72–81; W. F. Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, i. 99–109, London, 1860; W. Bright, *Chapters of Early English Church Hist.*, passim, Oxford, 1897; *DCB*, iii. 592–593.

JUVENAL, ju've-nal: First patriarch of Jerusalem; d. c. 458. Of his life little is known, and the date and place of his birth, consecration, and death are also uncertain. The aim of his life was to make Jerusalem one of the important sees of Christendom, and the Council of Nicæa had, as a matter of fact, accorded the bishop of Jerusalem special rank and honor, though it placed him under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Cæsarea. Juvenal endeavored to realize the concession, and took the first step in this direction by transcending his authority in consecrating in the neighborhood a certain Peter bishop of a newly converted tribe of Saracens, and attaching him as so-called bishop "of Tarembolae" (i.e., "of the camp") to the see of Jerusalem, most probably in 425. This was considered a distinct breach of canon law by the metropolitan of Cæsarea. The resulting difficulties came to a head at the Council of Ephesus in 431. The conditions of the time favored Juvenal. Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, was accused of heresy; Cyril of Alexandria was temporarily imprisoned; John of Antioch held a separate council; and the see of Rome was represented only by legates. To Juvenal, therefore, in Cyril's absence fell the right of precedence in signing the resolutions; or, in case Cyril was present, Juvenal's name came second. Juvenal did not hesitate to make the most of these conditions. He summoned John of Antioch to proceed at once to Ephesus, ranked the see of Jerusalem as on a par with that of Rome and gave it the title "apostolic," which he denied to Antioch. These indications show plainly that Juvenal aspired not only after an independent see within the archbishopric of Cæsarea, but after superiority over, or at least, equality with, that of Antioch. He aimed to have the three bishoprics of Palestine attached to Jerusalem, and also, if possible, those of Phenicia and Arabia. The result would be to make the holy city the principal see in the Orient.

Several bishops who had been ordained by Juvenal and were present at Ephesus, supported his claims; this fact, and the absence of the above-mentioned bishops from the principal sees were extremely favorable to his ambitions. Cyril of Alexandria appeared, however, at the fourth session of the council, and at once took charge of the proceedings. He saw the danger not only for the see of Antioch but for that of Alexandria in the existence of a masterful bishop of Jerusalem. He therefore opposed every plan of Juvenal. Neither did the idea of a new competitor for supremacy in Christendom please the fancy of the legates of the Roman see. It could not be foreseen what complications might arise in favor of Jerusalem, particularly since pilgrimages to the holy city were becoming more frequent every year. But Juvenal had gained an advantage of which he made the most. He ordained several new bishops in Palestine without having any stipulated right by canon law. His influence was growing constantly, and Maximus of Antioch at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 acknowledged Juvenal's claims to the three sees of Palestine on condition that the latter abandon his claims to the sees of Phenicia and Arabia. The council confirmed the agreement.

Juvenal had numerous difficulties with the monophysitic monks of Palestine; and even his life was threatened. He introduced the celebration of Christmas on Dec. 25, possibly to win the favor of Rome. See JERUSALEM, PATRIARCHATE OF; and MONOPHYSITES, § 2. (F. KATTENBUSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: The acts of the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, given in Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. ii. passim, Eng. transl., vol. iii. passim; the letters of Leo the Great, Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., vol. xii., cf. pp. 66, 82, 86, 97; Evagrius, *Hist. eccl.*, ii., in *MPG*, lxxxvi. 2. Consult: M. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, iii. 110 sqq., 164 sqq., Paris, 1740; Vailhe, in *Revue de l'orient*, iv (1899), 44 sqq.; *DCB*, iii. 595 sqq.; Neander, *Christian Church*, vol. ii. passim.

JUVENCUS, ju-ven'cus, **CAIUS VETTIUS AQUILINUS** (or **AQUILIUS**): Spanish presbyter and religious poet, in the reign of Constantine the Great, to whom he refers at the close of his principal poem. This is a rendering of the Gospels into Latin dactylic hexameters, with a close adherence to the original text, and contains 3,210 lines. The prologue speaks of earlier poets such as Homer and Vergil, whose names are well-nigh immortal though their subjects were only the deeds of men, and their narratives fictitious; places on a much higher plane the acts of Christ; and hopes, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to create a work that shall worthily set them forth, last beyond the conflagration of the world, and save the author himself from the fire. The events of the life of Christ are narrated now from one Evangelist and now from another, in what seemed to the author chronological order. Matthew is throughout his main source, and Mark does not seem to be used at all. The division into four books seems to have been an afterthought, intended to correspond with the number of the Evangelists. Juvencus adheres closely to the scriptural account, and is apparently withheld by reverence from any attempt to enlarge upon it. He was evidently at home in classical literature, and his diction is full of Vergilian echoes; the verse is flowing and for its period strikingly correct. This first Christian epic, although it made no pretense to be a complete narrative or a scientific harmony of the Gospels, and although it does not offer much help in the way of exegesis, of the history of dogma, or of textual criticism (it is based on the Itala as a text), was yet highly regarded in the early Church and continued to be prized throughout the Middle Ages, being frequently used as a text-book in schools. Its popularity is attested by the large number of manuscripts in which it is preserved. A work by Juvencus on the sacraments mentioned by Jerome has been lost. Some of the later manuscripts give under the name of Juvencus two other poems, *De laudibus Domini* and *Triumphus Christi*, of 148 and 108 verses. The former is probably older than Juvencus and the work of a rhetorician from Augustodunum (Autun). The 6,000 verses on the Old-Testament history which Cardinal Pitra discovered and attributed to Juvencus are now thought to have been written by a fifth-century Gallic Cyprian (not the famous Carthaginian bishop). The style is dry and jejune, and the poetical execution far inferior to that of Juvencus. Nor is it possible now to attribute to him the *Liber in Genesim* (1441 verses) which Martène published in 1723 from a Codex Corbeiensis, and which Galland, Arevolo, Gebser, Bähr, Teuffel and others believed to be his.

(K. LEIMBACH†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The poem has often been edited and printed since the editio princeps of Paris, 1449, is in *MPL*, xix.; ed. C. Marold, Leipsic, 1886; and, ed. J. Huemer, in *CSEL*, xxiv., Vienna, 1891. Consult: J. Huemer. in *Wiener Studien*, ii. 81–112, Vienna, 1880; A. R. Gebser, *Dissertatio de . . . Juvenci vita et scriptis*, Jena, 1827; A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters*, i. 109 sqq., Leipsic, 1889; J. T. Hatfield, *A Study of Juvencus*, Bonn, 1890; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, iii. 116–118; *DCB*, iii. 598–599.

JUXON, WILLIAM: Archbishop of Canterbury; b. at Chichester (57 m. s.w. of London), baptized in Oct., 1582; d. in London June 4, 1663. He received his education at St. John's College, Oxford; became vicar of St. Giles, Oxford, 1609; rector of Somerton, Oxfordshire, 1615; head of St. John's, 1622, and vice-chancellor 1626–27, and in 1626, dean of Worcester; became bishop of London in 1633; on Mar. 6, 1635–36, he became lord high treasurer, a difficult post; he attended Charles I. to the scaffold as his most faithful servant; was deprived of his see in 1649; and in 1660 was recognized as the only eligible candidate for the primacy, and was elected. He left a well-deserved reputation for strict honesty, loyalty to Church and king, and great charity to the poor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. H. Marsh, *Memoirs of Archbishop Juxon*, London, 1869; *DNB*, xxx. 233–237.

K

KAABA, kā′a-ba: The pre-Mohammedan sanctuary at Mecca, adopted by the Mohammedans as the chief sanctuary of their faith. It is situated in the heart of Mecca, the sacred city of Islam (see MOHAMMED, MOHAMMEDANISM), in a court approximately 535 feet by 355 feet which forms an irregular oblong, the long axis of which is approximately n.e.-s.w., while its sides are only approximately parallel. The wall which bounds the enclosure does not preserve its direction throughout on any one of the four sides, while on the northeastern and southwestern sides are projections forming two large halls. The wall is pierced by nineteen ungated entrances. On the inside and next to the bounding wall a triple or, in some places, a quadruple, colonnade a little over twenty feet in height limits the open area, while each group of four columns supports a small dome as a part of the roof of the colonnade. The ground level of the area inside the walls is lower than that outside. The Kaaba itself is near the center of the enclosure, a structure in the form of a trapezium, no two sides exactly parallel, with its long axis transverse to that of the court, the diagonals being nearly in the direction of the cardinal points, one corner of the building being said by the Arabs to face the North Star. The structure is about fifty-five feet by forty-five, and between thirty-five and forty feet in height, built of the common gray stone of the district, the courses of which are irregular. Its roof is nearly flat, yet sufficiently inclined to shed the rainfall easily. The main structure rises from a sloping base two feet in height. It has no windows and but one door, placed on the eastern side about six feet from the southeast corner and seven feet from the ground. At the southeast corner is the Black Stone, an irregular oval about seven inches in diameter, the pieces of which it is composed being joined by cement. It has an uneven surface, though it is worn smooth by the constant kissing and rubbing to which it has for ages been subjected by the faithful. It is described now as being a deep reddish brown, but whether it is basaltic or a meteorite is undetermined, with probabilities in favor of the latter. It is set in the wall about fifty inches from the pavement, and is surrounded by a border of composite cement so set as to form a boss, and this is supported by a circle of gold or silver or gilt. In the northeast corner is another stone of the material common about Mecca, eighteen inches by two in size, set horizontally in the wall, which receives a secondary veneration, being rubbed by pilgrims with the right hand but never kissed. A slight hollow in the northeastern side in the pavement is lined with marble and is hallowed as the place where Abraham and Ishmael mixed the material with which they built the Kaaba. The roof is sustained by three cross beams, each supported in the center by a column covered with decorated aloe wood. In the northern corner is a small door leading to a staircase and the roof, used only by the attendants for purposes of work. The roof of the Kaaba is covered by a robe or mantle which hangs over the sides. This is made at Cairo by a family in which the monopoly is hereditary, and is made of coarse silk and cotton. The interior of the court about the Kaaba has three levels: (1) a pavement of marble immediately surrounding the Kaaba in an irregular oval, about which is an oval of small columns between which lamps are suspended; (2) a second pavement about twenty feet broad and slightly higher than the interior pavement; (3) a pavement six inches higher and about forty feet in width, surrounding the two inner pavements. Between the outer edge of this last and the colonnade the ground is graveled except where the stone walks lead to several of the gates. There are a number of smaller structures at different points of the outer pavement which serve various purposes, one of them covering the sacred well Zem Zem. The lowest pavement next the Kaaba is that upon which the sevenfold circuit of the building is made by the pilgrims.

Arabic legend asserts that the present structure is the tenth in historical order. The first was built by the angels before the creation; the second by Adam; the third by Seth, and was destroyed in the deluge; the fourth by Abraham; the fifth by the Amalikah, descendants of Shem; the sixth by the Beni Jurham, about the Christian era; the seventh by Kusay bin-Kilab, fifth in order of ascent among Mohammed's paternal ancestors; the eight in Mohammed's twenty-fifth (thirty-fifth) year; the ninth in 686 A.D. (64 A.H.) by Abdullah bin-Zubaye, nephew of Ayesha, after the Black Stone had been split by fire or by the weapons of an enemy; the tenth between 1652 and 1662 A.D., after the partial destruction of the house by flood in 1652. The ceremony of circumambulation was performed about all of these, according to Arab tradition. That the Kaaba has a high antiquity is made certain by Diodorus Siculus who asserts that " there is in this country (Arabia) a temple greatly revered by all the Arabs." The very universality of reverence asserted here and supported by Arab tradition guarantees an early origin for the structure.

GEO. W. GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The foregoing description of the Kaaba is taken from a careful comparison of the accounts of R. F. Burton, *Narrative of a Pilgrimage to Meccah and Medinah*, chaps. xxvi.–xxx., and Appendix, London, 1879; A. Sprenger, *Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammed*, ii. 340–347, 3 vols., Berlin, 1861–65; and J. L. Burckhardt, *Travels in Arabia*, pp. 136 sqq., London, 1829. The history is taken from W. Muir, *Life of Mahomet*, vol. i., pp. ccx. sqq., London, 1861; and A. P. Caussin de Perceval, *Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'islamisme*, i. 170–175, Paris, 1847.

KABASILAS, ka-bā′sî-las: Two metropolitans of Thessalonica during the fourteenth century. Nilos, the elder, lived about 1340 under John Cantacuzenus, and belonged to the strict anti-Roman party, so that his writings were first noticed among the Protestants (e.g., *De primatu papae*, ed. M. Flacius Illyricus, Frankfort, 1553). Far more important was his nephew **Nikolaos** (d. 1371). Of his life the only details known are that he was originally bursar at Constantinople and sided with the Palaeologi, but afterward became a friend of John Cantacuzenus, who used him on political missions. In the Hesychastic controversy (see Hesychasts) he sided with the monks of Athos, and was later appointed metropolitan of Thessalonica. Nikolaos is known as a philosopher, but more especially as a theologian. Among his philosophical writings special mention may be made of one directed against skepticism (ed. Elter and Radermacher in *Analecta Graeca*, Bonn, 1899.) The most important of his theological writings was his "Seven Books concerning the Life in Christ" (ed. W. Gass, Greifswald, 1849). The line of thought is briefly this. True to the development of Greek theology, Kabasilas regards the *summum bonum* as exaltation above the sensual, the introduction into life and immortality, as given through Christ. Man is to be transplanted from the present world to the future. This transfer is made by Christ himself. The life in Christ which transfers man to the other world is perfected through the sacraments and the human will. Baptism means to man the beginning of a new existence. The second sacrament, that of unction, is unction of the spirit, and initiates man into the true Christian calling. The Eucharist adds the third degree of perfection, and produces an inward change, causing a mystic kinship with Christ. By the side of this physiological mysticism stands a non-monastic system of ethics. Kabasilas teaches that the will must conform unreservedly to the sacramental influences, being thereby supplied with a train of pious thoughts. Through joy and sadness it becomes purified. Finally the climax of love is reached, and with it perfect altruism. Kabasilas indulges in lofty expressions when he describes the power of love, declaring that as once it had caused God to descend to man, so now it breaks the bonds of selfish isolation and constrains man to live for God, and not for self. This power of love rises to complete self-renunciation and self-forgetfulness, and this is the state of him in whom sacrament and will work together in perfect harmony. Philipp Meyer.

Bibliography: The Works are in *MPG*, cl. Consult: Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, x. 20–30; Demetrakopulos, *Graecia orthodoxia*, pp. 76 sqq., 83 sqq., Leipsic, 1872; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 109–110, 158–159; W. Gass, *Die Mystik des Nikolaos Kabasilas*, Leipsic, 1899.

KABIR: Hindu religious leader. See India, I., 3, § 3; Sikhs, Sikhism.

KADESH. See Negeb.

KAEHLER, kê′ler, **CARL MARTIN AUGUST:** German Protestant; b. at Neuhausen (7 m. n.e. of Königsberg), Jan. 6, 1835. He studied law at Königsberg (1853–54), and theology at Heidelberg (1854–55), Halle (1855–58), and Tübingen (1858–59); became privat-docent at Halle, 1860; associate professor of theology at Bonn, 1864; went in a similar capacity to Halle, 1867, and has been full professor of systematic theology and New-Testament exegesis in Halle since 1879. His writings include: *August Tholuck, ein Lebensabriss* (Halle, 1877); *Julius Müller, der hallische Dogmatiker* (1878); *Neutestamentliche Schriften in genauer Wiedergabe ihres Gedankenganges dargestellt* (3 vols., comprising Hebrews, Galatians, and Ephesians, 1880–94); *Die Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre* (3 parts, Erlangen, 1883–87); *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche Christus* (1896); *Jesus und das Alte Testament* (Leipsic, 1896); *Dogmatische Streitfragen* (2 vols., (1898); *Wiedergeboren durch die Auferstehung Jesu Christi* (1901); and *Die Sakramente als Gnadenmittel* (1903).

KAEHLER, LUDWIG AUGUST: German Protestant; b. at Sommerfeld (44 m. s.s.e. of Frankfort-on-the-Oder), Prussia, Mar. 6, 1775; d. at Königsberg Nov. 7, 1855. He attended the Royal School at Meissen, the Gymnasium at Gorau, and the University of Erlangen, and, after spending two and a half years as private tutor, became assistant pastor at Kanig, near Guben, in 1798. Here he found leisure to write a number of romances, some of which won even Goethe's approval. He declined a call to the office of general superintendent of Lower Lusatia, but in 1809 entered upon the diaconate at Guben. Ten years later he was called to Königsberg as consistorial counselor, professor of theology, and superintendent of the Löbenicht parish. He took an important part in the direction of the provincial Church, and after Borowski's death officiated four years as acting general superintendent. In 1841 he resigned all his offices on account of a paralytic stroke. Kähler was one of the chief representatives of a rationalistic-idealistic school, which, like that of Schleiermacher, rejected both supernaturalism and the older rationalism of the Enlightenment. He was largely under the influence of the philosophy of Kant and Jacobi. His principal works are: *Geschichte von Cottbus, während der Jahre 1813–14* (Cottbus, 1814); *Supernaturalismus und Rationalismus in ihrem gemeinschaftlichen Ursprunge, ihrer Zwietracht und höhern Einheit* (Leipsic, 1818); *Philagathos: Andeutungen über das Reich des Guten* (Königsberg, 1823); the unfinished *Christliche Sittenlehre* (1st section of part 1, 1833); and *Wissenschaftlicher Abriss der christlichen Sittenlehre* (2 parts, 1835–37). Hermann Hering.

Bibliography: S. A. Kähler, *Ludwig August Kähler, . . . Mittheilungen über sein Leben und seine Schriften*, Königsberg, 1856 (by his son).

KAFTAN, kāf′tān, **JULIUS WILHELM MARTIN:** German Protestant; b. at Loit (a village near Apenrade, 35 m. n. of Schleswig), Schleswig-Holstein, Sept. 30, 1848. He was educated at the universities of Erlangen, Berlin, and Kiel from 1866 to 1871, and in 1873 was appointed associate professor of systematic theology at Basel, where he was promoted to a full professorship in the same subject in 1881. Since 1883 he has been professor of apologetics and the philosophy of religion at Berlin. He has written *Sollen und Sein in ihrem Verhältnis zu einander* (Leipsic, 1872); *Die Predigt des Evangeliums im modernen Geistesleben* (Basel, 1879); *Das Evangelium des Apostels Paulus in Predigten der Gemeinde dargelegt* (1879); *Das Wesen der christlichen Religion* (1881); *Das Leben in Christo* (sermons, 1883); *Die Wahrheit der christlichen Religion* (1888); and *Dogmatik* (Tübingen, 1897).

Earlier Life. Professor at Breslau.

KAHNIS, hā'nîs, KARL FRIEDRICH AUGUST: German Lutheran theologian; b. at Greiz (49 m. s.s.w. of Leipsic) Dec. 22, 1814; d. at Leipsic June 20, 1888. Despite the poverty of his parents, he was educated at the gymnasium of his native town, and after acting as private tutor for several years began the study of theology at Halle. He was at first an ardent Hegelian, but becoming conscious that Hegelianism failed to recognize the value of individual effort, personality, and the influence of the Christian faith, he passed to orthodox Lutheranism. The transition may be dated from the publication of his *Dr. Ruge und Hegel: Ein Beitrag zur Würdigung Hegelscher Tendenzen* (Quedlinberg, 1838). At the invitation of Hengstenberg, Kahnis went in 1840 to Berlin, where he studied under Neander, Marheineke, Twesten, and others. To Tholuck's *Litterarischer Anzeiger für christliche Theologie* he contributed a criticism of Strauss, which appeared in expanded form under the title *Die moderne Wissenschaft des Dr. Strauss und der Glaube unserer Kirche* (Berlin, 1842). In 1842 he became privat-docent and then spent two happy years in close relationship with Neander, Steffens, and the circle of romanticists who gathered about Ludwig von Gerlach. In 1844 he was called to Breslau as professor extraordinary to represent the orthodox party in a rationalistic faculty, but in his inaugural speech *De Spiritus Sancti persona* he departed from the accepted doctrine of Trinitarianism, ranking the Son as subordinate to the Father, and assigning the last place to the Holy Spirit, which he described as the impersonal principle of life, binding together the other two. This first venture of Kahnis into the field of theology is important for his subsequent development. Hampered to a large extent in his academic work by the lack of harmony between himself and his colleagues, he devoted himself to scientific investigation in theology, the first results being his *Lehre vom heiligen Geiste* (Halle, 1847), which marked no departure from the doctrines enunciated in his earlier work, yet voiced his protest against the liberalism of the times.

Professor at Leipsic.

After the revolution of 1848, in which Kahnis supported the king and the established order, he came to believe that the safest defense against irreligion was in rigid orthodoxy, and gradually drifted into an attitude of opposition to the Union (the consolidation of the Lutheran and Reformed churches in Prussia effected by a royal decree in 1817). He strove to preserve the integrity of the Lutheran creed. Convinced at last that the Lutheran confession possessed neither a logical nor a legal basis under the Union, he joined the old Lutheran party in Nov., 1848, a step by which his academic activity at Breslau became still more difficult. In 1850, therefore, he gladly accepted a call to Leipsic, where he succeeded Harless in the chair of dogmatics, to which he later united that of church history. In the following year the University of Erlangen gave him the degree of D.D., and he acknowledged this honor by his *Lehre vom Abendmahle* (Leipsic, 1851), one of the best formulations of the type of Lutheranism taught at Erlangen. His professorial work at Leipsic was attended with success, but, feeling himself out of sympathy with the prevailing tone in the faculty, he would have accepted a call to Erlangen in 1856 had not the authorities promised to fill the first vacancy in the faculty by a theologian entirely in agreement with his own views. In the same year, Luthardt was called from Marburg, and he and Kahnis, together with Delitzsch, who came to Leipsic from Erlangen in 1867, constituted a triumvirate which raised the university to an unrivaled eminence in the realm of theology. In addition to his academic duties, Kahnis found time for much useful labor in the field of practical Christianity. From 1851 to 1857 he was a member of the board of missions, from 1853 to 1857 edited the *Sächsische Kirchen- und Schulblatt*, and from 1866 to 1875 was one of the editors of the *Niednersche Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*. At Leipsic in 1854 he published *Der innere Gang des deutschen Protestantismus seit Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts* (Eng. transl. by T. Meyer, *Internal History of German Protestantism since the Middle of Last Century*, Edinburgh, 1856), expanded in the second edition (1860) so as to include the entire period from the Reformation. These same years witnessed a literary controversy with Nitzsch over the question of the Union and confessional latitudinarianism, a controversy in which Kahnis sought to demonstrate the lack of doctrinal unity prevailing among the supporters of the movement.

Later Views and Works.

In 1860 Kahnis became canon of the cathedral at Meissen and in 1864–65 he was rector of Leipsic University. Before that time, however, his religious views had undergone the change which found expression in his *Lutherische Dogmatik* (3 vols., Leipsic, 1861–68). The character of the work was foreshadowed in the second edition of *Der Innere Gang*, which revealed an approximation to rationalism, the abandonment of his old belief in inspiration, a readiness to admit the necessity of progress in doctrine, and an insistence upon the importance of recognizing the facts of human nature and natural morality. The five divisions of the *Dogmatik* deal with the history of Lutheran dogmatics, religion, revelation, creed, and system. The problem which Kahnis set himself was the derivation of the doctrines of the Lutheran Church from the basic principle of justification by faith, and the proof of their verity by the sole authority of the Scriptures. He found the nature of Christianity in the community of salvation between man and God through Christ in the Holy Spirit, seeking his proof in history, philosophy, and the common facts of life. It was not the system he advanced that aroused opposition, but the liberal attitude assumed by him toward the higher critics of the New Testament, his readiness to adopt the most of their theories, and his consequent modification of the doctrine of inspiration, as well as his dissent from the dogma of the Church in respect to the Trinity and the Lord's Supper. Hengstenberg was the most prominent among those who now accused Kahnis of apostasy. In 1864 he published the second volume of his *Dogmatik*, wherein he traced the history of the development of dogma in connection with the history of the Church, so as to prove the Lutheran doctrines of the present day the logical result of this twofold development. The third volume, *Das System*, which appeared in 1868, was disappointing, partly because its contents repeated the matter contained in the first two volumes, and partly because it contradicted the basic principle of investigation laid down in the first part. In 1871 he published at Leipsic a condensation of the historical portion of the work under the title *Christentum und Luthertum*, a treatise written in a masterly fashion and constituting, together with the third edition of *Der innere Gang*, the best of his literary productions. After the completion of his *Dogmatik*, Kahnis devoted himself especially to his historical studies, wherein his work may be characterized as marked less by the modern spirit of painful research, than by a strong sympathy with his subject and an exceptional charm of style. To this period belong his *Deutsche Reformation* (Leipsic, 1872) and his *Gang der Kirche in Lebensbildern* (1887). His success as a teacher was due both to the graciousness of his personality and his lofty conception of his duties. (Johannes Kunze).

Bibliography: F. J. Winter, *Karl Friedrich August Kahnis*, Leipsic, 1896; C. Schwarz, *Zur Geschichte der neuesten Theologie*, pp. 311–317, Leipsic, 1864.

KAÏRES, kā'î-rêz (**KAÏRIS**), **THEOPHILUS:** Modern Greek liberal; b. on the island of Andros Oct. 19, 1784; d. on the island of Syra Jan. 12, 1853. After attending the academy at Cydonia, he studied for eight years in Pisa and in Paris, coming under the influence of Count Frayssinous (q.v.) and imbibing the political doctrines of the French Revolution. Returning to his fatherland in 1810, he taught in Smyrna and in Cydonia. After the successful termination of the War of Liberation, in which he took an active part, he was admitted to the priesthood and formed the plan of founding an orphan asylum on Andros especially for the sons of those who had fallen in the war. He collected funds for the project by a journey to western Europe and in 1835 opened an institution which soon became the resort of all Greeks who would learn modern culture in their native land. Then rumors were spread that the fasts were not observed on Andros, that the customary prayers were not offered in the school, and that scientific doctrines were taught which were at variance with those of the Church. Writings were disseminated, treating of the "Fear of God," asserting the purely human character of the Scriptures and attacking ecclesiastical dogmas and mysteries. The national synod felt called upon to interfere and by an official ordinance of July 10, 1839, demanded from Kaïres a statement of his belief. He attempted to evade the issue, claiming that he was no theologian and had not taught dogmatic theology; in philosophy, however, he had taught the existence of God and immortality as well as a final judgment. When the synod renewed its demand he asked for a few months more time and offered to close his orphan asylum and go wherever the authorities might require. The synod, influenced by the narrowly orthodox patriarch Gregory VI. (q.v.), had him brought to Athens and put him on trial Oct. 21, 1833. He repeated his former declarations, adding that he had taught nothing contrary to Christianity, refused to give a more detailed exposition of his faith, and offered to leave the country. By intervention of the government he was sent for further reflection, first to a monastery on the island of Sciathus, then at his own request to a more healthful and agreeable place of confinement in a monastery on Thera. Persisting in his course, in Oct., 1841, he was deposed and excommunicated. He then lived abroad, most of the time in London, until 1844, when he was permitted to return to Andros. Protected by an old school friend, the minister Koletti, he resumed his former activity more boldly than ever. Koletti died in 1847, however, and when Kaïres published (Athens, 1849) his most important book, Γνωστική, the best exposition of his religious system, his opponents made formal charge against him under a section of the criminal law, declaring that all adherents of religious sects not recognized by the government should be treated as members of forbidden societies. On Dec. 21, 1852, Kaïres was condemned to two years and one month imprisonment in Syra; two of his friends were sentenced for shorter terms. The judgment was set aside by the Areopagus on appeal Jan. 26, 1853, but in the mean time Kaïres had died in prison at Syra. (Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: C. A. Brandis, *Mitteilungen über Griechenland*, i. 299–304, iii. 36–38, Leipsic, 1842; J. Wenger, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des gegenwärtigen Geistes und Zustandes der griechischen Kirche*, pp. 11–13, Berlin, 1839; A. D. Kyriakos-Rausch, *Geschichte der orientalischen Kirchen*, pp. 191–194, Leipsic, 1902; E. Curtius, *Ein Lebensbild in Briefen*, ed. F. Curtius, pp. 165, 215, Berlin, 1903; Further literature in Greek is given in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xix. 669–670.

KAISER, kai'zer (**KAESER**), **LEONHARD:** German reformer; b. at Rab (a market-town near Schärding, 8 m. s.s.w. of Passau) about 1480; executed at Schärding Aug. 16, 1527. He was educated at Leipsic, and about 1517 became vicar of Waitzenkirchen, but in accordance with the Regensburg Edict of 1524 was cited before the consistory of Passau for preaching Evangelical doctrines. After a brief imprisonment, he was permitted to return to his congregation, whereupon, in defiance of the duke's prohibition forbidding his subjects to attend the University of Wittenberg, he matriculated there June 7, 1525, and for a year and a half enjoyed the teaching of Luther and his colleagues. Despite personal danger, he returned to Rab in the early part of 1527 on account of his father's mortal illness, and himself fell sick. Denounced by the parish priest of Rab, Kaiser was arrested and imprisoned at Passau on Mar. 11, 1527. He refused to retract his views, and his trial, because of the prominence of his family, attracted wide attention. Luther sent him a letter of consolation (*Luthers Briefwechsel*, ed. E. L. Enders, vi. 54–55, Frankfort, 1895), but all petitions, including those of the count of Schaumberg, the margrave of Brandenburg, and even the elector of Saxony, were in vain. On July 18, he was condemned to be unfrocked and executed and the sentence was carried out on Aug. 16, when he was delivered to the secular arm and burned at the stake. (T. KOLDE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. Roth, *Ein evangelischer Märtyrer aus dem Innviertel*, Halle, 1900; V. A. Winter, *Geschichte der Schicksale der evangelischen Lehre*, i. 237 sqq., Munich, 1809; A. Schmid, in *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Geschichte*, iv (1887), 308 sqq.

KAISERSWERTH. See DEACONESS, III., 2, a; FLIEDNER, THEODOR.

KALDI, kāl′dî, **GYÖRGY:** Hungarian Jesuit; b. at Tyrnau (60 m. e. of Vienna), Hungary, 1570; d. at Presburg (35 m. e. of Vienna) Oct. 30, 1634. He held various positions in his order, preached in Vienna, taught theology at Olmütz, and finally became head of the college at Presburg. He translated the Bible into Hungarian (Vienna, 1626), and published a part of his sermons (2 vols., Presburg, 1631). His translation of the Bible (see BIBLE VERSIONS, B, ix., 2) has been frequently reprinted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. and A. de Backer, *Les Écrivains de la compagnie de Jésus*, s.v., 7 vols., Liége, 1853–61; *KL*, vii. 50, ii. 770–771.

KALISCH, kā′lish, **(MORITZ) MARCUS:** Biblical scholar; b. of Jewish parentage at Treptow, Pomerania, Prussia, May 16, 1828; d. at Rowsley (18 m. n.n.w. of Derby), Derbyshire, England, Aug. 23, 1885. He studied classical and Semitic languages at the universities of Berlin and Halle (Ph.D., 1848), and Talmudic literature at the rabbinical college in Berlin. On the subsidence of the revolutionary movement of 1848, in which he had been actively interested, he settled in London. From 1849 till 1853 he was secretary to the chief rabbi, N. M. Adler, through whom he obtained a tutorship in the family of Baron Lionel Rothschild. Throughout the remainder of his life he was intimate with the Rothschilds and their munificence enabled him to devote himself to scholarly work. He planned a *Historical and Critical Commentary on the Old Testament with a New Translation*, and published *Exodus* (London, 1855), *Genesis* (1858), and *Leviticus* (2 vols., 1867–72), which at the time of publication were the best commentaries on the respective books in the English language and are not yet wholly superseded, having especial value as the work of a learned Jew. Ill health prevented the continuation of the work and also interrupted a projected series of *Bible Studies* after the appearance of *The Prophecies of Balaam* (1877) and *The Book of Jonah* (1878). Kalisch also published a Hebrew grammar (2 parts, 1862–63; 2d ed. of part i., 1875); a book of poems in German (Leipsic, 1868); *Life and Writings of Oliver Goldsmith* (London, 1860); and *Path and Goal; a Discussion on the Elements of Civilization and the Conditions of Happiness* (1880).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. S. Morais, *Eminent Israelites of the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 170–173, Philadelphia, 1880; *DNB*, xxx. 237; *JE*, vii. 420.

KALKAR, kāl′kār, **CHRISTIAN ANDREAS HERMANN:** Danish theologian; b. in Stockholm Nov. 27, 1803; d. at Copenhagen Feb. 2, 1886. He was the son of a Jewish rabbi, spent his childhood at Cassel, Germany, where his father held a high position in the Jewish community, and upon the latter's death went to Copenhagen (1812), being later admitted to the university of that city. From 1819 to 1823 he devoted himself to the study of law, but on being baptized chose a theological career, and was graduated in theology in 1826. In the following year he was appointed adjunct at the Latin school of Odense, and in 1834 became rector. During his stay in Odense he published a commentary on the Old Testament (1836–38), a history of the Bible (2 vols., 1837–1839; German transl., Kiel, 1839), and lectures on the apostolic history (1840). In 1842 he received a royal stipend enabling him to travel through European countries to collect material for a history of Denmark during the Reformation, and on his return was appointed minister at Gladsaxe, near Copenhagen. In 1845 he published as the result of his travels "Documents relating to the History of Denmark in the Time of the Reformation," which was intended as an introduction to a contemplated *Corpus reformatorum Danicorum*, but he was prevented from accomplishing his task by a fire which destroyed his collected material. In 1847 he published, with other theologians, a new Danish version of the Bible, with maps and illustrations. During the following years Kalkar devoted himself more to the history of missions, and published numerous works on Protestant and Roman Catholic missions in general as well as missions among Jews and Mohammedans. As a historian in this field, however, he displayed a lack of critical and thorough investigation, which detracts from the value of his works. In 1868 he retired from active life, and spent the remainder of his days in Copenhagen, engaged in literary pursuits. (F. NIELSEN†.)

KALTEISEN, kālt-ai′zen, **HEINRICH:** Dominican; b. at Ehrenbreitstein (2 m. e. of Coblenz), Rhenish Prussia, c. 1390; d. at Coblenz Oct. 3, 1465. He early entered the Dominican convent at Coblenz, and studied subsequently at Vienna and at Cologne, where he became professor of theology and also a preacher of note. Later he was stationed at Mainz as inquisitor-general for Germany. He attended the Council of Basel, and, in 1433, made himself famous by a three days' speech against the demand of the Hussites for the free preaching of the word of God (printed by Canisius, in *Thesaurus monumentorum ecclesiasticorum et historicorum*, ed. J. Basnage, iv. 628–708, Antwerp, 1725). During his residence at Basel he seems to have been prior of the Dominican convent there. In 1443 he was made *magister sacri palatii* by Eugenius IV., and in 1452 Nicholas V. made him titular archbishop of Trondhjem. In 1463 he retired to the cloister of his order at Coblenz. Friedrich Steill edited a few of Kalteisen's writings in *Ephemerides dominicano-sacræ* (Dillingen, 1692), but most of his works remained in manuscript.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Quetif and J. Echard, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum*, i. 828, Paris, 1719; *KL*, vii. 58.

KAM, kām, **JOSEPH:** Dutch missionary to the Moluccas or Spice Islands; b. at Bois-le-Duc (28 m. s.s.e. of Utrecht) 1770; d. on the island of Amboyna, Malay Archipelago, 1833. He early desired to be a missionary, but yielded to his father's wishes and became a business man. At the age of forty he resigned his position as court messenger at Amsterdam, and entered the missionary seminary at Berkel, where his elder brother was educating candidates for the Netherlands Missionary Society. The Indian colonies being at that time in the hands of the English, he entered the service of the London Missionary Society, in whose seminary at Gosport he spent a year. In 1813 he was sent to the Moluccas. The heathen population there had been forcibly Romanized by the Portuguese in the sixteenth century, and in like manner transferred to the Reformed Church by the Dutch at the beginning of the seventeenth century. When Kam appeared on the scene, everything was in a sad state of decline. At rare intervals a preacher would make a hasty visit to the islands to baptize children by throngs, and to solemnize marriages. Kam took up his abode on Amboyna, where in 1817 he was appointed government preacher. He now developed a wonderful activity in reviving the defunct Christian congregations. The twenty thousand or more baptized members were organized under his charge, into eighty congregations, the remotest of them being 300 miles away. For his journeys he had a vessel built, which he himself commanded as captain. Thanks to his exertions seventeen missionaries were sent out during the years 1819–32, including Schwarz and Riedel, who became distinguished for their success in Celebes. Honored as "apostle of the Moluccas," Kam labored on indefatigably till his end.

R. GRUNDEMANN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: L. J. van Rhijn, *Reis door den indischen Archipel*, pp. 443 sqq., Rotterdam, 1851; E. F. Kruijf, *Geschiedenis van het Nederlandsche Zendelinggenootschap*, Groningen, 1894; P. Wurm, in *Allgemeine Missions-Zeitschrift*, 1897, pp. 365 sqq.

KAMMIN, kām′min, **BISHOPRIC OF:** A bishopric named from the town of Kammin (Cammin) in Pomerania, near the Baltic (38 m. n.n.e. of Stettin). Among the companions of Otto of Bamberg (q.v.) in his missionary work in Pomerania was a priest named Adalbert, who, when Otto's plan for the erection of a bishopric at Julin, the present Wollin, was carried out, became its first bishop. At Adalbert's request, Innocent II. took it in 1140 under papal protection, and assigned to its jurisdiction, besides the town of Wollin, ten other *castra*. Nothing was said about its inclusion in any ecclesiastical province, though in 1160 the imperial pope, Victor IV., placed it under Magdeburg. A little later Wollin was destroyed in the war between the Danes and Saxons, and the see was consequently transferred to Kammin in 1175, apparently once more as an exempt bishopric. This status it managed to retain, except between 1216 and 1244, when it was again subject to Magdeburg. Three attempts were made in the fourteenth century to assert over it the metropolitan rights of Gnesen, but the Curia decided against them in 1371. The Reformation found the diocese in a state which facilitated its introduction. Its spread began from the Premonstratensian monastery of Belbuck, of which Bugenhagen was an inmate. The Dukes Bogislas X. and George were hostile to it; Barnim, however, forwarded it, and after the death of the last Roman Catholic Bishop Erasmus von Manteufel (1544) a Protestant was appointed in his place, and the estates of the bishopric and the monasteries secularized.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: K. F. W. Hasselbach, J. G. L. Kosegarten and F. von Medem, *Codex diplomaticus Pomeraniae*, vol. i., Greifswald, 1843; L. Giesebrecht, *Wendische Geschichten*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1843; *Pommersches Urkundenbuch*, ed. R. Klempin and R. Prümers, 3 vols., Stettin, 1868–91.

KAMPHAUSEN, kāmp-hɑu′zen, **ADOLF HERMANN HEINRICH:** German Protestant; b. at Solingen (18 m. n.n.e. of Cologne) Sept. 10, 1829; d. at Bonn Aug. 13, 1909. He studied at the University of Bonn (Ph.D., 1855), where he was privat-docent for a few months before he went to Heidelberg as private secretary of C. K. J. Bunsen. Still in the service of Bunsen, he was privat-docent at the University of Heidelberg from 1856 to 1859, when he returned with his employer to Bonn; there he was associate professor of Old-Testament exegesis 1863–68, full professor 1868–1901. From 1871 to 1890 he was a member of the committee for the revision of Luther's translation of the Old Testament. He regarded Christ as the bodily son of Joseph and Mary, and held that the Resurrection was an objective or real vision. He contributed the translation of the Books of Kings, Proverbs, and II Maccabees to E. F. Kautzsch's *Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments* (Freiburg, 1894), and wrote independently among other works *Die Hagiographen des Alten Bundes nach den überlieferten Grundtexten übersetzt und mit erklärenden Anmerkungen versehen* (Leipsic, 1868); *Die Chronologie der hebräischen Könige* (Bonn, 1883); *Das Buch Daniel und die neuere Geschichtsforschung* (Leipsic, 1892); *Book of Daniel* in *The Polychrome Bible* (New York, 1896); and *Das Verhältnis des Menschenopfers zur israelitischen Religion* (Bonn, 1896).

KANT, kānt, **IMMANUEL:** German philosopher; b. at Königsberg, Prussia, Apr. 22, 1724; d. there Feb. 12, 1804. His father, of Scotch descent, was a saddler in humble circumstances, his mother a woman of great natural force and fervent piety.

Life and Works.

His entire life with exception of a few years as tutor in a country family was spent in his birthplace. After graduating from the University of Königsberg and teaching for several years, in 1755 he became privat-docent, in 1770 full professor at the university. Here his chief subjects were logic, metaphysics, physical geography, anthropology, moral philosophy, and mathematics; other subjects were natural law, encyclopedia of philosophy, natural theology, pedagogics, theoretical physics, mechanics, and mineralogy. His philosophical writings fall into two groups—the dogmatic or pre-critical, influenced by Leibnitz and Christian Wolff, until 1770; the critical, due in part to Hume's influence (1770–1804), wherein his principal works appeared, combating both the dogmatism of Leibnitz and Wolff and the empiricism of Hume. The writings of the earlier period may be passed over here, for it is upon the great systematic works of the second period that Kant's fame rests. His new point of view is first seen in the Latin dissertation *De mundi sensibilis atque intelligibilis forma et principiis* (Königsberg, 1770); but more important for the critical philosophy were the epoch-making *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (Riga, 1783; revised ed., 1787; best Eng. transl. by F. Max Müller, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 2 vols., London, 1881, 1 vol., 1897) and the briefer and more popular *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können* (Riga, 1785; Eng. transl., *Prolegomena to Every Future Metaphysic which can appear as a Science*, London, 1819). These works are concerned with epistemology and metaphysics. Of fundamental importance for Kant's ethics and religious philosophy are: *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten* (Riga, 1785); *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft* (1788); *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft* (Königsberg, 1793; Eng. transl., *Theory of Religion*, Edinburgh, 1838); and *Die Metaphysik der Sitten* (2 parts, Königsberg, 1797; Eng. transl., *Metaphysics of Ethics*, 3d ed., with introduction by H. Calderwood, Edinburgh, 1871). Other works belonging to this period are: *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Naturwissenschaft* (Riga, 1786); and *Kritik der Urtheilskraft* (Berlin and Libau, 1790; Eng. transl., *Kritik of Judgment*, London, 1892). Kant's works were edited by G. Hartenstein (10 vols., Leipsic, 1838–39; another ed., in chronological order, 8 vols., 1867–69), by K. Rosenkranz and F. W. Schubert (12 vols., 1838–40), and by J. H. von Kirchmann (8 vols. and supplement, Berlin, 1868–73). Other translations from Kant are: *Prolegomena and Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science, Translated . . . with a Biography and Introduction*, by E. B. Bax (London, 1883); *Critique of Practical Reason, and Other Works on the Theory of Ethics*, Translated by T. K. Abbott (4th ed., 1889); and *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Ethics . . .* , translated by T. K. Abbott (1895).

Philosophy in Outline.

Kant characterized his metaphysical standpoint as transcendental idealism (see IDEALISM). In his epistemology he taught that there are two sources of knowledge: sensation—given through the senses, and thought—intuitions of space and time and categories of the understanding. This knowledge is restricted to phenomena. By pure reason *a priori* we are, however, compelled to affirm the reality of a noumenal world, not as this is in itself, but as it appears to us, and then only as to its form. A basis is here laid for the later divorce of theoretical knowledge and religious faith, as in Mansel's *Limits of Religious Thought* (London, 1858), and in the theology of Albrecht Ritschl (q.v.). Religion is the recognition of one's duty as divine commands. Commands are proved to be divine through our sense of them as duties (natural religion); whereas those which we know as divine commands become our duty (revealed religion). Religion is essentially belief in God as a good will realizing itself in nature and history, evinced by neither prophecy nor miracle, but by the same good will in ourselves—its object to develop and confirm the will of good in us. The sovereign test of the Bible is our own morality. Sin, which presupposes free causality, is an extra-temporal, voluntary adoption by the reason of an evil motive, but incapable of further explication. Regeneration takes place through one's becoming aware of the ideal of moral perfection, and forgiveness through the ethical reproduction of the same ideal as that which the Church attributes to Christ. The Church is the invisible body of the redeemed. Kant subjected the traditional theistic arguments to a searching scrutiny, with the result that these lost most of their cogency. His criticism reached the following conclusions: (1) concerning the ontological argument—the idea does not prove the objective existence of its content; (2) as to the cosmological argument, an infinite series of finite causes is thinkable, the cause which this argument postulates is not a necessary cause, and even if the necessary cause were thus reached, this would not be the God of theology; (3) the teleological proof—mentioned with respect—rests on the unproved assertion of universal adaptation and teleology, and leads to an artificer not to a Creator; (4) the moral proof, drawn from conscience and feeling of responsibility, the universality and teleology of the moral order, is invalid in the light of pure reason, although it holds good for the practical reason. Kant's denial of the worth of the theistic arguments, to which must be added freedom and immortality, means not that these are finally to be rejected, but, incapable of proof by reasoning, are removed to the jurisdiction of the practical reason. In the moral consciousness are given those ideas of God, freedom, and immortality. The reason had not denied freedom, but conceived it as an intelligible, not as an empirical, reality; and since freedom was the absolute condition of moral responsibility, the practical reason postulated immortality as the sphere within which this moral problem was to be solved, and God as the guarantor both of the moral order and the ultimate realization of the good will. The only good without qualification is a good will. The categorical imperative as addressed to the will compels a teleological interpretation of reality and a recognition of the autonomy of the practical reason. In the *summum bonum* virtue and happiness must be thought of as combined, but virtue is supreme and is alone worthy of happiness. Owing to the supremacy of the practical reason, man is to act as if the postulates of the moral consciousness were proved. Kant's ethical teaching is marked by "vigor and rigor." Duty stands in no relation to feeling. Duty is for duty's sake alone. The moral law admits of no exceptions. His categorical imperative enjoins, "Act only on that maxim which thou canst at the same time will to become a universal law."

Summary.

Kant's philosophy as a whole may now be characterized: (1) We know phenomena, not things in themselves. (2) Objects are scientifically known, i.e., by the reason, *a priori*, since they are created by the understanding. (3) Our knowledge is objectively valid for phenomena or for possible experience, but not outside of these. (4) Things-in-themselves are intelligible ideal realities, belonging to the unity of the All-Real Being, teleologically related to the highest good. (5) Philosophy culminates not in the theoretical but in the practical reason, giving rise to a rational working faith (cf. F. Paulsen, *Immanuel Kant,* Eng. transl., pp. 115–116, New York, 1902. The philosophy of Kant has been profoundly influential in religious thought. First, in the further working out of the dualism involved in his epistemology (neo-Kantian theology); secondly, in the transcendence of that dualism in the assertion of the ultimate unity of thought and being (idealistic theology); thirdly, in the supremacy of the practical reason as related on the one hand to theological construction and on the other to personalism as the solution of the conflict between naturalism and religion (cf. R. Otto, *Naturalism and Religion* (London, 1906). See PANTHEISM, § 5.

C. A. BECKWITH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature upon Kant is enormous—cf. the list of works in J. M. Baldwin, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology,* iii. 1, pp. 286–320, New York, 1905. On the life the best single book is F. Paulsen, *Immanuel Kant, sein Leben und seine Lehre,* Stuttgart, 1898, Eng. transl., *Immanuel Kant, his Life and Doctrine,* New York, 1902; L. E. Borowski, *Darstellung des Lebens und Charakter Kants,* Königsberg, 1804 (revised by Kant himself); H. Schmidt, *Immanuel Kant's Leben,* Halle, 1858; K. Fischer, *Kants Leben und die Grundlagen seiner Lehre,* Mannheim, 1860; J. H. W. Stuckenberg, *Life of Immanuel Kant,* London, 1882; M. Kronenberg, *Kant, sein Leben und seine Lehre,* Munich, 1891.

On his philosophy consult: J. Barni, *Philosophie de Kant,* Paris, 1851; M. B. W. Bolton, *Kant and Hamilton,* London, 1866; K. Fischer, *Commentary on Kant's "Critick of the Pure Reason,"* ib. 1866; C. Düwell, *Kant's Religionsphilosophie,* Fürstenwalde, 1872; J. Kaftan, *Die religionsphilosophische Anschauung Kants,* Basel, 1874; F. Paulsen, *Versuch einer Entwickelungsgeschichte der kantischen Erkenntnisstheorie,* Leipsic, 1875; E. Caird, *The Philosophy of Kant Explained and Examined,* London, 1877; idem, *The Critical Philosophy of Emmanuel Kant,* 2 vols., Glasgow, 1889; C. Ritter, *Kant und Hume,* Halle, 1878; J. G. Schurman, *Kantian Ethics and the Ethics of Evolution,* London, 1881; J. H. Stirling, *Text-book to Kant,* ib. 1881; G. S. Morris, *Kant's Critique of Pure Reason,* Chicago, 1882; G. Thiele, *Die Philosophie Immanuel Kants,* 2 vols., Halle, 1882–87; W. Wallace, *Kant,* Oxford, 1882; J. McCosh, *A Criticism of the Critical Philosophy,* New York, 1884; J. P. Mahaffy, *Kant's Critical Philosophy for English Readers,* 2 vols., London, 1889; J. Royce, *The Spirit of Modern Philosophy,* Boston, 1892; T. H. Green, *Works,* ed. R. L. Nettleship, ii. 2–155, London, 1893; C. W. Hodge, *Kantian Epistemology and Theism,* Philadelphia, 1894; V. Basch, *Essai . . . sur l'esthétique de Kant,* Paris, 1896; A. Cresson, *La Morale de Kant,* ib. 1897; W. M. Washington, *The Formal and Material Elements of Kant's Ethics,* New York, 1898; T. Ruyssen, *Kant,* Paris, 1900; H. S. Chamberlain, *Immanuel Kant, die Persönlichkeit als Einführung in das Werk,* Munich, 1905; G. Gerland, *Immanuel Kant, seine geographischen und anthropologischen Arbeiten,* Berlin, 1906; J. Guttmann, *Kants Gottesbegriff in seiner positiven Entwicklung,* ib., 1906; M. Apel, *Kommentar zu Kants "Prolegomena,"* ib., 1908; O. Ewald, *Kants kritischer Idealismus als Grundlage von Erkenntnistheorie und Ethik,* ib., 1908; J. Watson, *The Philosophy of Kant Explained,* Glasgow, 1908.

KANTZ, KASPAR: Reformer of Nördlingen; b. at Nördlingen (38 m. n.n.w. of Augsburg) in the last quarter of the fifteenth century; d. there Dec. 6, 1544. Some time before 1501 he appears to have entered the monastery of the Carmelites in Nördlingen and in 1501 went to the University of Leipsic. In 1502 he became bachelor, 1505 master, 1511 *biblicus,* and 1515 *sententiarius.* He returned to his native city and became prior of the monastery, but was deposed in 1518, although he was allowed to remain in the monastery. Whatever may have been the reason for his deposition, it is certain that at a very early time he advocated the ideas of the Reformation. After the church of the Carmelites had opened its doors to the Gospel, there followed the church of St. George, where Billican preached from Nov., 1522. Although the city council considered public sentiment, it was averse to all decisive measures, and when Kantz openly announced from the pulpit that he had taken a wife, he was expelled from the city on June 26, 1523. From one of his sermons, printed in 1524, he appears to have been recalled. In 1530 he applied in vain for the position of "Latin schoolmaster" in Nördlingen. In the list of preachers he appears as *diaconus* first in 1535, but before that time he held the position of German schoolmaster. On June 21, 1535, he was placed as preacher at the head of the churches in Nördlingen in place of the wavering Billican. The first church order of Nördlingen of 1538 was his work. He also promoted catechetical instruction, which had been neglected by Billican, and succeeded in bettering the moral conditions.

Kantz was the real reformer of Nördlingen. He enriched Evangelical devotional literature by writings which bear comparison with those of the more famous men of the sixteenth century. He deserves an honorary place in the history of the Evangelical church service because he drew up and put in practise a German Evangelical mass four years before Luther's German mass, under the title, *Von der Euangelischen Messz. Mit Christlichen Gebetten vor vnd nach der empfahung des Sacraments* (1522). It was the first attempt to arrange a German celebration of the Lord's Supper according to Evangelical principles in close relation to the Roman formulary. Kantz also wrote an excellent book for the sick, *Wie man den krancken vnnd Sterbenden menschen ermanen, trösten, vnnd Gott befelhen soll, das er von diser Welt, seligklich abschaide* (Augsburg, 1539; Strasburg, 1556; Nuremberg, 1568, and 1580; Tübingen, 1577), which was read also by the Roman Catholics. He published also *Die Historia des leydes Jesu Christi nach den vier Euãgelisten. Vnd auch von der Juden Osterlam; mit trostlicher ausslegung* (Augsburg, 1538; enlarged 1539; Nuremberg, 1555), a book distinguished by its religious depth, and left a catechism (Nördlingen, 1542), besides composing some hymns.

(C. GEYER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. Geyer, *Kaspar Kantz,* in *Beiträge zur bayerischen Kirchengeschichte,* ed. T. Kolde, v. 101–127, Erlangen, 1898; idem, *Die Nördlinger evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des 16. Jahrhunderts,* pp. 1–23, Munich, 1896; J. D. Haakh, in V. L. von Seckendorf, *Hist. Lutheranismi,* iii. 183 sqq., Leipsic, 1692; A. Steichele, *Das Bistum Augsburg,* iii. 954–955, 1024 sqq., Augsburg, 1872; H. Beck, *Die Erbauungslitteratur der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands,* i. 168 sqq., Erlangen, 1883; idem, *Die religiöse Volkslitteratur der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands,* p. 40, Gotha, 1891; J. Smend, *Die evangelischen deutschen Messen,* passim, Göttingen, 1896.

KAPFF, SIXT KARL: German Protestant; b. at Güglingen (20 m. n.w. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, Oct. 22, 1805; d. in Stuttgart Sept. 1, 1879. From early childhood he was religiously disposed, and at the University of Tübingen he engaged in daily prayer with his intimate friend, Wilhelm Hofacker. After filling the positions of vicar at Tuttlingen, teacher in the Fellenberg school at Hofwyl, Switzerland, and repetent in Tübingen, he became, in 1833, pastor of the colony of Pietists at Kornthal, near Stuttgart. In 1843 he was made *Dekan* at Münsingen, and in 1847 at Herrenberg. He was transferred to Reutlingen in 1850, and to Stuttgart in 1852, where, for the remainder of his life he was *Prälat* and the greatly beloved and influential pastor of the *Stiftskirche.*

Kapff combined the genial manners, trustfulness, and sympathetic warmth of the Swabian character. He was a friend to ministers all over Württemberg, and attracted all classes who had an interest in religion. As a preacher, he did not represent any sharply defined theological or ecclesiastical tendency. His sermons had much of the supernaturalism of the old Tübingen school, but more warmth and sympathy than belonged to it. He had an eye to the domestic and social wants of his people, and drew largely upon his every-day intercourse with them for his subjects. He also took a warm interest in the ecclesiastical affairs of Württemberg, and in foreign missions as advanced by the missionary institution in Basel. For more than a quarter of a century, he was the center of the pious circles of the land.

The best known of his publications are: *Gebetbuch* (Stuttgart, 1835; 21st ed., 1905); *Communionbuch* (1840; 24th ed., 1901); *Das kleine Communionbuch* (1841; 36th ed., 1905); *Warnung eines Jugendfreundes* (1841; 20th ed., 1902); *Achtzig Predigten über die alten Episteln* (1851; 6th ed., 1879); *83 Predigten über die alten Evangelien* (1862; 6th ed., 1876); and *Casualreden* (ed. C. Kapff, 1880).

(KARL VON BURK†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. Kapff, *Lebensbild von Sixt Karl Kapff*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1881 (by his son).

KAPPEL, PEACE OF. See ZWINGLI, HULDREICH.

KARAITES, kê′ra-aits.

The Sect in Babylonia (§ 1).
In Palestine (§ 2).
Religious Philosophy (§ 3).
Egypt and the Crimea (§ 4).
Constantinople (§ 5).
Poland (§ 6).
Doctrine and Law (§ 7).

The name of the Karaites (Hebr. *Ḳara'im*, sing. *Ḳara*), a very important Jewish sect, may be an intensive noun from the verb *ḳara*, " to read," signifying " readers," i.e., readers of the Bible *par excellence.* It is better, however, to take *Ḳara* as a denominative form from *miḳra* (Aram. *ḳera*), " Scripture " and to interpret it as an " adherent of the Scriptures," i.e., one who follows strictly the text of the Bible and rejects the rabbinical tradition of the Talmud. This explanation finds support in the fact that the Karaites are also called *Bene Miḳra,* " sons (adherents) of the Scripture," as opposed to the *Bene mishnah,* or " sons of the mishnah " or of tradition.

1. The Sect in Babylonia.

The founder of the Karaite sect was Anan ben David, who, according to tradition, was disappointed in his expectations of becoming either *gaon* (head of one of the Babylonian academies) or *resh galuta* (head of the Babylonian diaspora), and therefore renounced the Talmud, founding at Bagdad in 761–762 a new community which rejected mishnaic and talmudic tradition. Like all prominent Karaites, he wrote a *Sefer ha-Mizwot* (" Book of Precepts ") and two other works, of which only a few fragments are extant; the statement that he wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch is without proof. Anan's pupil Mocha and his son Moses (780–800) introduced a new system of vowels and accents which displaced the former system and promoted the Masorah, while other Karaites applied the so-called hermeneutical rules (*middot*), borrowed from Mohammedan theology, to the interpretation of the law. At a very early period the Karaites followed the philosophical tendency of Mohammedanism, and about 800 Judah Yudghan attacked the rabbinical doctrine of the anthropomorphism of God. His system was elaborated by Benjamin ben Moses Nahawendi, who flourished about 830. According to him, God is too exalted to reveal himself to man, and revelation was accordingly made by the medium of an angel, who not only created the world but also performed all the acts of God recorded in the Torah. Benjamin's writings, with the exception of his *Sefer dinim* (" Book of Laws ") are known only from citations. With Benjamin and a few others the Arabic period of Karaism came to a close, and the Karaite communities of Babylonia and Persia soon lost their importance.

2. In Palestine.

Under the impulse of the Messianic expectations which are a marked characteristic of Karaism, Palestine now became the center of a Karaite propaganda, which, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, reached even to Greece and Spain, while the Karaites living in Jerusalem took the name of *Shoshanim* or *Maskilim,* with reference to Dan. xii. 3. Karaite congregations already existed in Egypt, and Constantinople was selected as a missionary field; but the chief object of attack was the first and last great teacher of Judaism to polemize against them, Saadia Gaon (b. 892; d. 942), who had assailed Hiwi al-Balkhi and Ibn Sakuyah in his *Kitab al-Tamyiz* (" Book of Distinction "), written in 926, and in his *Sefer Emunot we-De'ot* (" Book of the Articles of Faith and Doctrines of Dogma "), written seven years later. The first Karaite who wrote against Saadia was Solomon ben Jeroham (b. at Fostat c. 915–920; d. about 960), whose *Milḥamot Adonai* (" Wars of the Lord ") is still extant in its main portions. He also wrote commentaries on Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon, The Psalms, and Lamentations, as well as others which are now lost. He denounced philosophy and all other sciences, and acknowledged only the study of the Torah, although he respected the Mishnah. His partizan, the Jerusalem Karaite Sahl ben Mazliah also wrote against Saadia and the latter's disciple, Samuel ben Jacob. Solomon ben Jeroham's successor, Yafith ibn Ali (Japheth ha-Levi) of Bassora, the greatest and most fruitful Karaite exegete, was also an opponent of Saadia, but he was moderate in his polemics and in his commentaries quoted many passages from his opponent. He paid special attention to grammar, and in lexicographical respects his commentaries, which are extant on the entire Old Testament, are very instructive. Like Benjamin Nahawendi, he referred Isa. liii. to the Messiah and his sufferings, in opposition to the Rabbinical exegetes, who, on account of their hostility to Christianity, referred the chapter to the people of Israel. Yafith lived about 915–1008, and wrote his commentaries in the last quarter of the tenth century, apparently composing his *Sefer ha-Mizwot* before his commentaries. In the first half of the eleventh century lived Abu al-Faraj Harun of Jerusalem, the author of a grammatical work entitled *Mushtamil* (" The Comprehensive "), in which he compared Hebrew with Arabic. He also wrote an Arabic commentary on the Bible, in which he explained all difficult words and sometimes entire sentences. To the middle of the eleventh century belongs Jacob ben Reuben, the author of commentaries on the Bible, composed chiefly of compilations from older authorities.

3. Religious Philosophy.

With the first half of the tenth century began the first epoch of Karaite religious philosophy which was based upon the Arabic scholastic theology of the *kalam* (literally "word"; cf. *logos*), a system developed in the second century of the Hejira, and intended, according to the statements of the Arabs themselves, to harmonize tradition with philosophy. It therefore afforded a means of defending religious doctrines by arguments based on reason, and was primarily directed against the tenets of the heterodox sects, and secondarily against the teachings of the philosophers. Thus Aaron ben Elijah (see below, § 5) could contrast the *Mutakallamun* (" teachers of the word "), with the "philosophers," or the Aristotelians, whereas the main elements of the *kalam* were evolved from the Peripatetic philosophy. The *Mutakallamun* also include the Mohammedan sect of the Mutazilites ("Separatists, Dissenters"; see MOHAMMEDANISM), who were founded by Wasil ibn Ata (b. 699/700; d. 748, 749), a contemporary of Anan and the founder of an Islamitic religious philosophy which professed a rationalistic formulation of Mohammedan dogmas in opposition to the liberal belief of traditional orthodoxy. The Karaites were closely allied to this sect, and their teachers even called themselves Mutakallamun.

The first religious and philosophical work of Karaism was the *Kitab al-Anwar* (" Book of Lights "), written by Jacob al-Kirkisani in 937, and devoted to a summary of the marriage law of the Karaites, so far as it deviated from the rabbinical system. He also wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch, and was followed in the eleventh century by Joseph ben Abraham ha-Roeh, who is mentioned by Maimonides in his *Moreh Nebukim* as a representative of the *kalam* and an opponent of Hai Gaon. Joseph was the author of *Kitab al-Muhtawi*, a philosophical work on " the roots of religion." Hitherto the Karaites, interpreting Gen. ii. 24 to mean that husband and wife form a unit, had made it almost impossible for them to marry among themselves. This theory was abolished by Joseph and his pupil Joshua ben Judah (Abu al-Faraj Furkan), although an exaggerated application of the method of analogy prohibited marriage within many degrees of affinity which were permitted by the rabbinical Jews. About the middle of the eleventh century Joshua ben Judah wrote an extensive commentary on the Pentateuch and a treatise on the law of marriage. According to his pupil Ibn al-Taras, the works of Joshua promoted Karaism in Spain, although they were soon counteracted by rabbinical Judaism.

4. Egypt and the Crimea.

In the twelfth century Egypt took the place of Jerusalem as the center of Karaism, and this century also marks decay of Arabo-Karaite literature, for its last representative was the physician Daniel, who wrote a work in 1682 in imitation of the *Hobot ha-Lebabot* (" The Duties of the Hearts "), composed by Bahya of Saragossa in the eleventh century, while Egypt was also the home of the Hebrew poet Moses Dari. There were also many congregations of Karaites in the Crimea, where a community is said to have existed in 1279. Crimean Karaite literature was extremely scanty, and little of it has been preserved, although it is known that the Karaites of the Crimea applied themselves diligently to the study of the law. Since they laid great stress on a sojourn in Jerusalem, which could easily be reached by way of Constantinople, several books of travel were written by Karaites, including Samuel ha-Kadosh ben David (1641–42), Moses ben Elijah ha-Levi (1654–1655), and Benjamin ben Elijah of Koslov (1785–86). About the middle of the eighteenth century there were 500 families in the Crimea, represented by four communities at Kala, Koslov, Kafa, and Manguf. In the Crimea the Karaites enjoyed special privileges, as when, in 1796, the Empress Catharine remitted half the poll-tax for every young man and also exempted them from military service.

5. Constantinople.

The Karaite community which existed at Constantinople in the early part of the eleventh century, and numbered 500 families in the second half of the following century, is important for the history and literature of the sect. There is no doubt that Karaites lived in Constantinople at the time of Judah Hadassi (b. at Jerusalem 1075; d. at Constantinople 1160), who began his *Eshkol ha-Kofer* (also called *Sefer ha-Peles*) in 1148. He classified all religion on the basis of the ten commandments and sought to oppose all heresies known to him. In natural history he had no superior among his contemporaries and he gave an extended and valuable account of the progress of philosophy, a subject which he also treated in his *Sefer Teren bi-Teren* on Hebrew homonyms. Karaite literature was especially promoted by two scholars named Aaron. The first of these was Aaron ben Joseph, whose literary activity falls between 1270 and 1300. He was a physician and wrote commentaries on the Pentateuch, the earlier and later prophets, and the Psalms. His most important work was his commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled *Mibhar* ("Choice") and completed in 1294. Aaron was likewise the author of a grammatical and exegetical hand-book entitled *Kelil Yofi* ("Diadem of Beauty") and a book of prayers which enjoyed great popularity among the European Karaites. The second Aaron was Aaron ben Elijah of Nicomedia (b. at Cairo 1300; d. at Constantinople 1369), who wrote *Eẓ ha-Ḥayyim* ("Tree of Life"), in which he developed the doctrinal system of the new faith, showing how the Jew should practise his religion to gain eternal life. He sought to blend the system of the *Mutakallamun* with the school of Maimonides, and thus produced an eclectic system, although at the same time he defended the *kalam*, which he followed rather than the Aristotelian method. In his *Gan 'Eden* ("Paradise") he recapitulated all his predecessors. This work, which is to the Karaites what the Maimonidean *Yad ha-Ḥazaḳah* is to the rabbinical Jews, is based upon the principle that the belief in the unity and other attributes of God as well as in his government of the world forms the end and aim of the law, while his *Keter Torah* ("Crown of the Law"), a commentary on the Pentateuch, is intended as an elucidation of his philosophical *Eẓ ha-Ḥayyim*. The latest bloom of Karaite literature in Constantinople is represented by the writings of Elijah Bashyazi (b. at Adrianople c. 1420; d. there 1490), the author of the *Aderet Eliyahu* ("Mantle of Elijah"), a summary of the works of his predecessors. His pupil and nephew, Caleb Afendopolo (b. 1465), completed the work of his master, in addition to writing independent works on theology, astronomy, and medicine, while his two *ḳinot* ("Lamentations") on the expulsion of the people of God from Spain, Russia, and Lithuania (1493) are historically interesting. A contemporary of Caleb was Judah ben Elijah ha-Gibbor, who enriched the liturgy of the Karaites, while his son Elijah Shusbi wrote a poem on the calendar. Moses Bashyazi, a great-grandson of Elijah Bashyazi, was a distinguished figure of the sixteenth century.

6. Poland.

While the literature of the Karaites in the Byzantine countries was mainly doctrinal, their Polish coreligionists, who were the last to produce Karaite literature, were obliged to write controversial books, owing to the inquiries of Christians. The first Karaites entered Poland at the end of the fourteenth century at the request of the king, coming from the Crimea to Lithuania, where Grand-duke Witold took them under his protection and granted them privileges which were afterward (1446) confirmed by King Casimir Jagellon. The first communities were at Lutsk and Troki, the two principal cities of Lithuania, and in 1581 Stephen Bathori allowed the Karaites to settle also in Volhynia, Podlasie, and Kiev. The first Karaite to make an open attack on Christianity was Isaac ben Abraham Troki (b. 1533), who opposed the Christian faith in the first part of his *Ḥizzuḳ Emunah* ("Confirmation of Faith") on the ground that the prophecies of the Old Testament can not refer to the founder of Christianity, while in the second part he criticized the contradictions in the Gospels. Mention may also be made of Mordecai ben Nisan, who wrote a treatise in answer to four questions propounded by Jacob Trigland, professor at Leyden, in Apr., 1698, the first being whether the Karaites were the ancient Sadducees or originated with Anan. Though full of anachronisms this treatise (entitled *Dod Mordechai*) possesses a certain amount of importance, since it was long the chief source for the history of Karaism. For the king of Sweden Mordecai wrote his *Lebush Malkut* on the differences between the Karaites and the Rabbanites, and was also the author of a book of grammatical rules (*Kelalim*). Equally noteworthy was Solomon ben Aaron Troki, the author of *Appiryon* (c. 1700), containing an account of the distinctive features and the origin of Karaism, together with an outline of its ceremonies, written for the information of the minister of the Swedish government. The second part of another work of the same name contains refutations of Christianity. In 1756 Simhah Isaac Lutski, one of the most revered and learned of the Karaites, wrote his *Oraḥ Ẓaddiḳim*, containing a list of the most celebrated Karaites and their works.

Karaite literature ends with Abraham Firkovich of Lutsk (d. at Chufut-Kale, 1874), whose valuable services to the criticism of the Old Testament are overshadowed by the systematic falsifications of manuscripts and epitaphs by which he sought to prove that the Karaites were the descendants of the Israelites who had been led into the Assyrian captivity and who had settled in the Crimea during the reign of Cambyses. Since 1830 the Crimean Karaites have had a printing-establishment at Eupatoria, where editions of their most important manuscripts have been published. Karaite communities are found not only in the Crimea but also in Jerusalem and Constantinople, as well as throughout Egypt, Galicia, Moldavia, Wallachia, and southern Russia. In 1871 the Karaites numbered about 6,000, but this number has decreased to some 5,500, the majority of whom live in Russia.

7. Doctrine and Law.

The Karaites recognize as binding precepts for religious and moral conduct only those which can be deduced from the Bible by means of an accurate exposition of the literal sense according to usage and context. From this main doctrine, which has been compared with that of Protestantism, other principles are inferred as necessary corollaries. They acknowledge no traditional exposition of passages of the Bible, but every experienced teacher is permitted to correct or change former interpretations according to the best of his knowledge and belief, provided his views are justified by the text; and such rabbinical laws as are recognized by the Karaites are regarded as valid solely because they are based on the Bible, this category including injunctions concerning slaughtering, fixing of the new moon, circumcision, and marriage. The introduction of new laws and the recognition of those which are non-Biblical are forbidden, and the Karaites, therefore, do not celebrate the Feast of Lights (*Ḥanukkah*). This strict adherence to the letter of the law, as based upon textual hermeneutics, has also exerted an influence upon individual rules and regulations. Important divergencies exist between the Karaites and the rabbinical Jews with regard to the Sabbath, phylacteries, (see TEPHILLIN) and the calendars, while less essential differences concern the celebration of the feasts, especially Passover, the Feast of Trumpets, and the Feast of Tabernacles, as well as the fasts and religious exercises. The earliest Karaite teachers formed the liturgy by omitting all rabbinical additions, so that religious customs have been exempt from change or discussion. The rigor with which the Karaites observe all their customs has had a deep influence on their lives. They are not content with religious worship on festivals and on semi-festivals like Purim, but refrain from work even on the intermediate days, while on fast-days they abstain from all commercial pursuits. The laws of ritual purity are also extremely exaggerated, and their strictness in the observance of legal obligations extends to the moral duties. They attend to their avocations in quiet simplicity, and generally wear dark clothing in their aversion for everything which pleases the sight.

The main principles of the religious system were fixed as early as the time of Hadassi, and were formulated in ten articles by Elijah Bashyazi and his pupil Caleb Afendopolo, as follows: (1) The universe was created (made out of nothing); (2) there is a Creator, who was neither created by any other power nor self-created; (3) he has no form, is one in every respect, and is like none of his creations; (4) God sent Moses, our teacher; (5) through him God revealed the Torah, which contains the absolute truth; (6) every Jew is bound to read the Torah in the original; (7) God also revealed himself to the other prophets; (8) God will raise the dead on the Day of Judgment; (9) God will recompense every one according to his deeds; (10) God will deliver Israel from their affliction and send to them the son of David. On the whole it may be said that the Karaites agree with the rabbinical Jews in fundamental doctrines, but differ from their opponents in carrying them out.

(VICTOR RYSSEL†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A minute, critical and extensive guide to literature concerning the Karaites, including the productions of their leaders, is given in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, x. 54–60, cf. 881–882. Consult also: S. Pinsker, *Liḳute ḳadhmoniot*, Vienna, 1860 (in Hebrew, on Karaite history and literature); A. Neubauer, in *JA*, 1865, i. 534–542; idem, *Aus der Petersburger Bibliothek; Beiträge und Dokumente zur Geschichte des Karäerthums*, Leipsic, 1866; G. Karpeles, *Geschichte der jüdischen Litteratur*, pp. 404–412 et passim, Berlin, 1886; *The Anti-Karaite Writings of Saadiah Gaon*, in *JQR*, x (1898), 238–276; *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel by Jephet ben Ali the Karaite, ed. in Arabic with transl. by D. S. Margoliouth*, in *Anecdota Oxoniensa*, 3d ser., i., part 3, Oxford, 1889.

On the history consult: J. M. Jost, *Geschichte des Judentums und seiner Sekten*, 3 vols., Leipsic, 1857–59; J. Fürst, *Geschichte des Karäertums*, 3 vols., ib. 1862–69 (to be used with caution); A. Gottlober, *Bikkoret letoledot Karaim*, Vilna, 1865; J. Gurland, *Ginse Yisrael*, St. Petersburg, 1865–66; W. H. Rule, *Hist. of the Karaite Jews*, London, 1870; A. Harkavy, *Denkmäler aus der Krim*, St. Petersburg, 1876; M. Steinschneider, *Polemische Literatur*, Leipsic, 1877; idem, *Arabische Literatur der Juden*, Frankfort, 1902; H. Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, especially v. 163–204, Leipsic, 1895, Eng. transl., London, 1892; *Semitic Studies in the Memory of Rev. Dr. A. Kohut*, pp. 435–456, Berlin, 1897; *David ben Sa'del, Ibn al-Hiti's Arabic Chronicle of Karaite Doctors, transl. by G. Margoliouth*, London, 1897; Ersch and Gruber, *Encyclopädie*, section II., vols. xxvii., xxxiii.; *JE*, vii. 438–447.

KARENS. See BURMA.

KARG, GEORG (GEORGIUS PARSIMONIUS): German Lutheran theologian; b. at Heroldingen (near Harburg, 31 m. n.e. of Augsburg) 1512; d. at Ansbach (25 m. s.w. of Nuremberg) Nov. 29, 1576. He was educated at Wittenberg, and then began to preach, though unauthorized by the university to do so. He promulgated heretical doctrines, however, and in 1537 was imprisoned in the castle of Wittenberg. He soon regained the confidence of Luther and Jonas, and the former, at the request of Count Louis of Oettingen, ordained Karg minister at Oettingen, where he worked zealously for the Reformation until forced to flee in 1547. He found a welcome in the district of Ansbach and was appointed pastor in Schwabach. In 1552 he received a call to Ansbach, and was soon made superintendent for the entire district. There he gradually allowed the rites of the Roman Catholic Church to fall into abeyance, and against the wishes of the government sought to abolish all usages of the *Auctuarium*, a sort of modified interim which had been introduced in an attempt to comply with the imperial demand. At the request of the prince, Karg took part in 1551 in the conferences of the Wittenberg theologians on the Council of Trent, and also attended the sessions of the conferences at Frankfort and Worms. His heretical tendencies had not entirely disappeared, however, and in 1557 he was involved in a discussion on the Eucharist, and later caused a commotion by his teaching concerning justification by faith, declaring that the law exacted either punishment or obedience, but not both, and that Christ had suffered passively for man, but had rendered obedience for himself. His active obedience, accordingly, was not part of his vicarious task, nor was his righteousness imputed to man in the Scriptures, Luther's interpretation of Phil. iii. 9 being incorrect. The atonement for the sins of mankind was due to the death of Christ, not to his righteousness, and he had confirmed the law, not abrogated it. The enunciation of these views resulted in a controversy, and Karg was suspended from office and obliged to make a solemn retraction before he was reinstated by Jakob Andreä (q.v.) on Oct. 31, 1570. The most important of his numerous writings was his *Katechismus*, which was first printed in 1564 and was still used in Ansbach in the early part of the nineteenth century.

(T. KOLDE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. F. Karrer, in *Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie und Kirche*, 1853, pp. 661 sqq.; G. Frank, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie*, i. 158 sqq., Leipsic, 1862, cf. J. J. I. Döllinger, *Die Reformation*, iii. 564 sqq., Regensburg, 1846.

KARTANOS, kār'tɑ-nes, **JOANNIKIOS:** Greek theologian of the sixteenth century; b. in Corfu at the end of the fifteenth or the beginning of the sixteenth century; place and date of death unknown. He was originally a monk and protosyncellus at Corfu, and in the first third of the sixteenth century was sent to Venice, where he incurred the hostility of Arsenios Apostolis and was imprisoned. He was later released and returned to Greece, but no further details of his life are known. Kartanos was one of the first to revive a knowledge of the Bible and the teachings of the Church among the common people by writing in Romaic, since they were no longer familiar with classic Greek. His chief work was his "Flower," written during his imprisonment and first published at Venice in 1536. It enjoyed immense popularity, but the admixture of apocryphal elements roused the hostility of the Orthodox Greek party. His heresies were successfully assailed and the movement which he had inaugurated was stopped. The ethical treatises of Kartanos were incorporated in the *Thesaurus* of Damascenus the Studite and thus gained a certain degree of currency in the Greek Church. (Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: E. Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellénique*, i. 226, Paris, 1885; P. Meyer, in *TSK*, 1898, pp. 315 sqq.; idem, *Die theologische Litteratur der griechischen Kirche im 16. Jahrhunderte*, pp. 120 sqq., Leipsic, 1899.

KASSHITES. See Babylonia, VI., 5.

KASSIA (KASIA): Byzantine poetess of the ninth century. Krumbacher (ut inf.) suggests that the form "Icasia" (Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, v. 199) is possibly a corruption of ἡ *Κασία*. She lived at Constantinople under the Emperors Theophilus (829–842) and Michael III. (842–867) in a cloister of her own founding. Both ecclesiastical and secular poems are extant under her name; but, excepting such as were adopted in liturgical books, they occur rarely in manuscript. Her three best known sacred hymns are the "Idiomela" on the birth of Christ, the birth of John the Baptist, and on Ash Wednesday. The last-named is identical with the song *Eis tēn pornēn*. W. Christ and N. Paranikas edited the three songs in their *Anthologia Græca* (pp. 10–104, Leipsic, 1871). Four short poems were published by Papadopulos-Kerameus (*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, x. 60–61, 1901), and an acrostic dirge and some epigrams were issued by Krumbacher (ut inf.). G. Krüger.

Bibliography: K. Krumbacher, *Kasia*, Munich, 1897; idem, *Geschichte*, pp. 715–716; P. Maas, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, x (1901), 54–59; S. Petrides, in *Revue de l'orient chrétien*, vii (1902), 218–244.

KATERKAMP, kā'ter-kāmp, **JOHANN THEODOR HERMANN:** German Roman Catholic; b. at Ochtrup (25 m. n.w. of Münster), Westphalia, Jan. 17, 1764; d. at Münster June 9, 1834. He studied in Münster, was ordained priest in 1787, and for ten years was tutor to the sons of Baron Droste-Vischering, spending a part of this time traveling with his wards in Switzerland and Italy. From 1797 till 1806 he resided in the home of Princess Amalie Galitzin. In 1809 he became professor of church history at Münster, and in 1831 was appointed dean of the cathedral at Münster. His principal work is his church history to the year 1153 (6 vols., Münster, 1819–34). He also published *Denkwürdigkeiten aus dem Leben der Fürstin Amalia von Gallitzin* (1828).

Bibliography: *Trauerrede*, by H. Brockmann, Münster, 1834; E. Rassmann, *Nachrichten von dem Leben und den Schriften Münsterländischer Schriftsteller*, ib. 1866; *KL*, vii. 333–335.

KATTENBUSCH, kāt'ten-būsh, **FRIEDRICH WILHELM FERDINAND:** German Lutheran; b. at Kettwig (7 m. s.s.w. of Essen) Oct. 3, 1851. He studied in Bonn, Berlin, Halle (1869–73), and Göttingen (lic. theol., 1875); became privat-docent in Göttingen, 1876; professor of systematic theology at Giessen 1878, at Göttingen 1904, and at Halle 1906. He was created a privy ecclesiastical councilor in 1897 and since 1903 has been a member of the Norwegian *Videnskabsselskabet*. In theology he is a follower of Albrecht Ritschl, and has written among other works: *Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Confessionskunde, i.* (Freiburg, 1892); *Das apostolische Symbol, seine Entstehung, sein geschichtlicher Sinn und seine ursprüngliche Stellung im Kultus und in der Theologie der Kirche* (2 vols., Leipsic, 1894–1900); and *Das sittliche Recht des Krieges* (Giessen, 1906).

KAULEN, kau'len, **FRANZ PHILIPP:** German Roman Catholic; b. at Düsseldorf Mar. 20, 1827; d. at Bonn July 11, 1907. He studied in Bonn (1846–49) and at the theological seminary in Cologne (1849), and was chaplain at Duisburg (1850–52) and Dottendorf (1852–53), rector and prison chaplain at Pützchen, near Bonn (1853–59), lecturer in the theological seminary at Bonn (1859–63), and privat-docent in the University of Bonn (1863–80). In 1880 he became associate professor of Old-Testament exegesis in Bonn, and full professor in 1882. After 1892 he was a domestic prelate to the pope. He edited the fifth to the eighth editions of C. H. Vosen's *Rudimenta linguae hebraicae* (Freiburg, 1872–1899); the twelfth to the eighteenth editions of the same author's *Kurze Einleitung zum Erlernen der hebräischen Sprache* (1874–1900); the second edition of the *KL* (12 vols., 1882–1903); and the second and third editions of K. Martin's translation of the "Antiquities" of Josephus (Cologne, 1883–92). As independent works he wrote: *Liber Jonae prophetae* (Mainz, 1862); *Legende von dem seligen Hermann Joseph* (1862); *Geschichte der Vulgata* (1869); *Handbuch zur Vulgata* (1870); *Einleitung in die heilige Schrift Alten und Neuen Testaments* (2 parts, 1876–1881); *Assyrien und Babylonien nach den neuesten Entdeckungen* (Cologne, 1877); *Kurze Einleitung in die heilige Schrift des Alten und des Neuen Testaments* (Freiburg, 1897); and *Der biblische Schöpfungsbericht erklärt* (1902).

KAUTZ, kauts **(CUCIUS), JAKOB:** Anabaptist; b. at Grossbockenheim (8 m. s.w. of Worms), Bavaria, c. 1500; d. after 1532. In 1524 he was preacher in Worms, where the reformatory movement took on a radical character, and Anabaptism found a favorable soil. The resentment of the citizens, caused by their long and violent struggles with the bishop, found expression at the beginning of the Reformation in violent attacks upon the Church and the clergy. The same tendencies showed themselves in the participation of the city in the Peasants' War. By the intervention of Count Palatine Ludwig, the bishop and the clergy were reinstated in their rights, but Evangelical preaching was continued. Among the Evangelicals there was a conservative and a radical party. Ulrich Preu and Johann Freiherr, two of the preachers, were in connection with Wittenberg while Kautz and Hilarius represented a more radical tendency, especially after the appearance of the two leading Anabaptists, Denk and Hätzer, in

Worms, whose teaching Kautz adopted in 1527. The number of Anabaptists in Worms grew rapidly. Kautz with Denk, Hätzer, and Melchior Ring published seven theses against their Evangelical opponents in which the peculiar teachings of Denk find expression: the distinction between the external and internal word of Scripture; the impossibility of all external words and sacraments to assure the inner man of his salvation; rejection of the baptism of children and of the essential presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper; universal salvation; denial of the objective value of Christ's satisfaction; and exhortation to follow him. The Lutheran preachers in Worms immediately replied, also Cochlaeus as representative of the Roman Catholics. The excitement in the town increased and the clergy of Strasburg declared themselves against the theses and warned the people of Worms. At the urgent request of Count Palatine Ludwig, the preachers of both Evangelical parties were dismissed, and severe measures were adopted against the adherents of Anabaptism among the citizens; but the power of Anabaptism in Worms and its neighborhood was not broken. The movement had found a sympathetic response among the people, and it was possible to hold it down only by force. As the Lutheran preachers had been banished at the same time, the progress of the Reformation in Worms was considerably retarded. Kautz wandered from place to place, leading the restless life of an agitator. In the summer of 1527 he appeared for some little time at Augsburg, then at Rothenburg-on-the-Tauber with Wilhelm Reublin. In June, 1528, they were both at Strasburg, disputing with the preachers; in October they were arrested for their inflammatory speeches. Capito and Schwenckfeld tried in vain to divert Kautz from his revolutionary ideas, and he was expelled from the city. In 1532 he reappeared before the town, begging to be admitted; disappointment, despair, and exhaustion had broken his courage; but the council did not receive him, and thenceforth he disappears from history. (A. HEGLER†.) K. HOLL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are in the works of Zwingli, vol. viii. passim, ed. of Zurich, 1828–61. Consult: T. W. Röhrich, *Geschichte der Reformation in Elsass*, i. 338 sqq., ii. 76–77, 1830–32; idem, in *ZHT*, 1860, pp. 20 sqq., 43 sqq., 60 sqq.; L. Keller, *Ein Apostel der Wiedertäufer*, Leipsic, 1882; C. Gerbert, *Geschichte der Strassburger Sektenbewegung*, pp. 57 sqq., 83–84, Strasburg, 1889; A. H. Newman, in *American Church History Series*, ii. 25, New York, 1894; idem, *Hist. of Anti-Pedobaptism*, pp. 170, 245 sqq., Philadelphia, 1897.

KAUTZSCH, kautsh, **EMIL FRIEDRICH:** German Protestant; b. at Plauen (21 m. s.w. of Zwickau) Sept. 4, 1841. He studied in Leipsic (Ph.D., 1863), taught in the Nicolai Gymnasium of Leipsic, 1863–72; became privat-docent in Leipsic, 1869, associate professor, 1871, full professor of Old-Testament exegesis at Basel, 1872; at Tübingen, 1880; at Halle, 1888. In 1877 he shared in founding the Deutscher Palästina-Verein. He has written: *De Veteris Testamenti locis a Paulo apostolo allegatis* (Leipsic, 1869); *Die Echtheit der moabitischen Altertümer* (1876; in collaboration with A. Socin); *Johann Buxtorf der Aeltere* (Basel, 1879); *Uebungsbuch zu Gesenius-Kautzsch hebräischer Grammatik* (Leipsic, 1881); *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (1884); *Predigten über den zweiten Jahrgang der württembergischen Evangelien* (Tübingen, 1887; in collaboration with H. Weiss); *Die Genesis mit äusserer Unterscheidung der Quellenschriften übersetzt* (Freiburg, 1888; in collaboration with A. Socin); *Die Psalmen übersetzt* (1893); *Abriss der Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Schrifttums* (1897); *Bibelwissenschaft und Religionsunterricht* (Halle, 1900); *Proverbs* in the *Polychrome Bible* (New York, 1901; in collaboration with A. Müller); *Die Poesie und die poetischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Tübingen, 1902); and *Die Aramäismen im Alten Testament* (Halle, 1902). He has also edited the second to the eighth edition of H. Scholz's *Abriss der hebräischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (Leipsic, 1874–99); the twenty-second to the twenty-seventh edition of W. Gesenius' *Hebräische Grammatik* (1878–1902); and the tenth and eleventh editions of K. R. Hagenbach's *Encyklopädie und Methodologie* (1880–1884). He likewise published, in collaboration with other scholars, *Die heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments* (Freiburg, 1894); *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (1899); and *Textbibel des Alten und Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen, 1900).

KAWERAU, kā′vê-rau, **PETER GUSTAV:** German Protestant; b. at Bunzlau (65 m. n.w. of Breslau), Silesia, Feb. 25, 1847. He studied at the University of Berlin (1863–66), and was pastor at Langheinersdorf, Brandenburg (1871–76), and Klemzig (1876–82). He became professor and spiritual inspector at the Kloster Unserer Lieben Frau, Magdeburg, 1882; professor of practical theology at Kiel, 1886; at Breslau, 1894. He was appointed university preacher at Kiel in 1888 and at Breslau in 1894, was created a consistorial councilor in the latter year; became provost of St. Peter's at Berlin, 1907. In 1883 he was one of the founders of the Verein für Reformationsgeschichte, and has edited: *Der Briefwechsel des Justus Jonas* (2 vols., 1885); shared in the Brunswick edition and edited the third, fourth, eighth, and part of the twelfth volumes of the Weimar edition of Luther (Weimar, 1885–91); *Zwei älteste Catechismen der lutherischen Reformation* (Halle, 1891); the third volume of W. Möller's *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (Tübingen, 1907); *Schlesisches Hauschoralbuch* (Breslau, 1898); and the fifth edition of J. Köstlin's *Martin Luther* (2 vols., Berlin, 1904–1905); As independent works he has written: *Johann Agricola von Eisleben* (Berlin, 1881); *Caspar Güttel, ein Lebensbild aus Luthers Freundeskreise* (Halle, 1882); *Ueber Berechtigung und Bedeutung des landesherrlichen Kirchenregiments* (Kiel, 1887); *De digamia episcoporum* (1889); *Luthers Lebensende in neuester ultramontanistischer Beleuchtung* (Barmen, 1890); *C. H. Spurgeon, ein Prediger von Gottes Gnaden* (Hamburg, 1892); *Hieronymus Emser* (Halle, 1898); *Die Versuche Melanchthon zur katholischen Kirche zurückzuführen* (1902); and *Luthers Rückkehr von der Wartburg nach Wittenberg* (1902).

KAYE, kê, **JOHN:** Bishop of Lincoln; b. at Hammersmith, London, Dec. 27, 1783; d. at Riseholme (2 m. n. of Lincoln), Lincolnshire, Feb. 18,

1853. He studied at Christ's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1804; M.A., 1807; B.D., 1814; D.D., 1815), where he became fellow in 1804. He was tutor of Christ's College, 1808–14, master 1814–30, vice-chancellor of the university 1815, and regius professor of divinity after 1816. In this capacity it was his peculiar service to recall theological students to the study of the Fathers. He was consecrated bishop of Bristol in 1820, and translated to Lincoln in 1827. His episcopal administration was marked by aggressiveness and efficiency. He increased the number of resident clergy in the diocese of Lincoln, revived the office of rural dean, and was the first bishop to require candidates for orders to pass the theological examination of the University of Cambridge which up to that time had been voluntary. His principal works are: *The Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, Illustrated from the Writings of Tertullian* (Cambridge, 1825); *The Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr* (1829); *The Writings and Opinions of Clement of Alexandria* (London, 1835); *The Council of Nicæa, in Connexion with the Life of Athanasius* (1853); *The External Government and Discipline of the Church of Christ during the First Three Centuries* (1855). All of these, with his sermons, charges, and miscellaneous writings, were collected in his *Works* (8 vols., London, 1888).

Bibliography: A *Memoir* is prefixed to the *Works*, ut sup. Consult *DNB*, xxix. 252–253.

KAYSER, kai′zer, **AUGUST:** German Protestant theologian; b. at Strasburg Feb. 14, 1821; d. there June 17, 1885. He was educated at the university of his native city, and was appointed assistant librarian in 1840. From 1843 to 1855 he acted as private tutor at Havre and Gebweiler. In 1858 he was appointed pastor at Stossweier, Upper Alsace, whence he went to Neuhof, near Strasburg, in 1868, and nine years later became associate professor of theology at the University of Strasburg. Influenced by his teacher, Eduard Reuss, Kayser was especially attracted to the study of the Old Testament, although his first scientific investigations dealt with the literature and theology of the first centuries of the Christian era. The results of these investigations were embodied in *La philosophie de Celse et ses rapports avec le Christianisme* (Strasburg, 1843), *De Justini Martyris doctrina dissertatio historica* (1850), and *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen* (in Reuss and Cunitz, *Beiträge zu den theologischen Wissenschaften*, iii., 1851).

By comparing the commandments with the historical traditions of the Pentateuch Kayser had early come to the conviction that the Elohistic code could not possibly antedate the restoration of the Jewish commonwealth under Persian rule. He had just prepared a work on this question when C. H. Graf's *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Leipsic, 1866) appeared, voicing the same view. Kayser therefore refrained from publishing his own book, and devoted himself to the problem from the point of view of literary history. The results of his studies appeared under the title *Das vorexilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels und seine Erweiterungen* (Strasburg, 1874). He wrote the posthumous *Die Theologie des Alten Testaments in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung dargestellt* (Strasburg, 1886). (A. Erichson†.)

KEACH, BENJAMIN: Particular or Calvinistic Baptist; b. at Stoke Hammond (11 m. n.e. of Aylesbury), Buckinghamshire, Feb. 29, 1640; d. at Southwark, London, July 18, 1704. He entered the Baptist ministry as a self-taught man in 1659, and suffered during his career frequent persecutions. On Oct. 8, 1664, he was tried at Aylesbury before Sir Robert Hyde, for having taken " certain damnable positions " regarding the second advent in a catechism he had published. He was sentenced to a fine of twenty pounds and two weeks' imprisonment, with the pillory on separate days at Aylesbury and Winslow. This sentence was rigorously executed, and Keach's little book was burned by the public hangman. In 1668 he removed to London and became pastor of the Baptist church in Tooley Street, Southwark. On the indulgence of 1672 his congregation erected a large wooden structure at Horsleydown. Keach was an advocate of congregational singing, and his church is said to have been the first Baptist church to introduce that practise (1688). He attained considerable fame as a preacher and defender of Baptist doctrines. His most important works are: *Tropologia: a Key to open Scripture Metaphors* (London, 1682; new ed., 1855); and *Gospel Mysteries Unveiled* (4 parts, 1701; new ed., 1856). Other works still remembered are, *Travels of True Godliness* (1683; new ed., 1849); *The Progress of Sin: or the Travels of Ungodliness* (1684; new ed., 1849); and *A Golden Mine Opened* (1694).

Bibliography: *DNB*, xxx. 254–255, where may be found references to scattered notices; a *Memoir*, by H. Malcom, was prefixed to his *Travels of True Godliness*, New York, 1831.

KEANE, JOHN JOSEPH: Roman Catholic archbishop of Dubuque, Ia.; b. at Ballyshannon (22 m. n.e. of Sligo), County Donegal, Ireland, Sept. 12, 1839. At the age of seven he was taken by his parents to the United States, and after engaging in business for some years, studied at St. Charles' College, Ellicott City, Md. (1859–62), and St. Mary's Theological Seminary, Baltimore (1862–65). He was ordained to the priesthood in 1866, and from that year until 1878 was curate of St. Patrick's, Washington, D.C. In 1878 he was consecrated bishop of Richmond, Va., whence he was translated, in 1888, to the titular see of Ajasso, that he might devote himself to the upbuilding of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., of which he had been appointed rector two years previously, when he had resigned his diocese at the request of the American hierarchy and of the pope. He remained at the head of the Catholic University until 1897, when he was elevated to the titular archdiocese of Damascus. On his return from a visit to Rome he was translated to his present archdiocese of Dubuque. During his curacy at Washington he helped to organize the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America and the Catholic Young Men's National Union, while during his episcopate at Richmond he established in his diocese the Confraternity of the Holy Ghost, besides taking part in the Third Plenary Council, held at Baltimore in

1884. He was likewise active in the promotion of religious and educational work among the colored people of his see. He was Dudleian lecturer at Harvard in 1890, and has written *Onward and Upward* (Baltimore, 1902).

KEATOR, FREDERIC WILLIAM: Protestant Episcopal missionary bishop of Olympia, Wash.; b. at Honesdale, Pa., Oct. 22, 1855. He was graduated at Yale College in 1880, the Yale Law School in 1882, and the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, in 1891. He practised law in Chicago from 1882 to 1890, and after completing his theological training was ordained to the priesthood in 1891. He was then rector of the Church of the Atonement, Chicago, 1891–96, Grace Church, Freeport, Ill., 1896–99, and St. John's, Dubuque, Ia., 1899–1902. In 1902 he was consecrated missionary bishop of Olympia.

KEBLE, JOHN: A leader of the Oxford movement in the Church of England (see TRACTARIANISM); b. at Fairford (24 m. s.e. of Gloucester), Gloucestershire, Apr. 25, 1792; d. at Bournemouth (25 m. s.w. of Southampton), Hampshire, Mar. 29, 1866. He was educated by his father (a clergyman) and at Corpus Christi College, Oxford; became fellow of Oriel (at the time the foremost college in Oxford) in 1811 and was tutor 1818–23; was ordained priest in 1816; became curate of East Leach and Burthorpe (near Fairford) in 1818, curate of Hursley, Hampshire, in 1825, vicar of Hursley in 1836. From 1831 to 1841 he held the lectureship on poetry at Oxford.

Keble's reputation rests on his contributions to devotional poetry and his share in spreading sacramentarian views in the Church of England and in the development of the Oxford movement. In 1827 he published, anonymously, *The Christian Year* (2 vols., Oxford), a collection of sacred lyrics, which had been issued in 140 editions when the copyright expired in 1873. Some of the poems have been pronounced faultless of their kind. In 1839 appeared *The Psalter, or Psalms of David in English Verse,* and in 1846 *Lyra Innocentium,* a collection of sacred poems for childhood. Of Keble's hymns the best in common use are " O God of mercy, God of might," and " Sun of my soul, thou Savior dear," the latter taken from the second poem in the *Christian Year,* entitled " Evening." With the help of his brother Thomas, and Charles Dyson, an intimate friend, he edited the works of Richard Hooker (3 vols., Oxford, 1836), spending five years on the task and producing what is still the standard edition (revised by R. W. Church and F. Paget, 3 vols., Oxford, 1888). In 1838 with F. W. Newman and E. B. Pusey he began to work on the *Library of the Fathers,* for which he translated Irenæus. At Oxford he was intimate with Newman, Pusey, and Richard Hurrell Froude, and his views concerning the sacraments—he regretted that circumstances did not admit of his introducing the confessional—and the episcopal constitution of the Church inevitably brought him to the front in the Oxford movement. Newman in his *Apologia* pronounces Keble its " true and primary author." He wrote nine of the *Tracts for the Times* (nos. 4, 13, 40, 52, 54, 57, 67, 60, 89), the first being on apostolic succession and the last on the mysticism attributed to the early Fathers. He approved of Newman's *Tract 90,* but did not leave the communion of the English Church and regarded the doctrine of the immaculate conception as an insuperable barrier to ecclesiastical union. Other works are *Praelectiones Academicae* (2 vols., Oxford, 1844), his lectures on poetry; *Sermons* (1847); and a *Life of Bishop Wilson* (2 vols., 1863). After his death appeared *Occasional Papers and Reviews* (Oxford, 1877) and eleven volumes of sermons (1876–80). Keble was not eloquent as a preacher, but scriptural and impressive. He had a remarkable power of attracting both old and young. Shortly after his death his friends and admirers raised a fund and erected to his memory Keble College at Oxford, which was opened in 1869.

D. S. SCHAFF.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Biographies are by J. T. Coleridge, 2 vols., Oxford, 1869; W. Lock, Boston, 1893. Consult also: J. C. Shairp, *John Keble: Essay on the Author of the " Christian Year,"* Edinburgh, 1866; *The Birthplace, Home, Churches and other Places connected with the Author of " The Christian Year," with Notes by J. F. Moor*, Oxford, 1867; J. H. Newman, *Essays Critical and Historical*, ii. 421 sqq., London, 1873, and cf. the *Apologia;* S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns*, pp. 500–502, New York, 1866; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 610–613; *DNB*, xxx. 291–295.

KECKERMANN, BARTHOLOMAEUS: German Reformed theologian; b. at Danzig 1571 (1573?); d. there Aug. 25, 1609. He studied at Wittenberg, Leipsic, and Heidelberg, where he became professor of Hebrew. From 1601 till his death he was rector and professor of philosophy at the Reformed Gymnasium of his native city. All his literary works grew out of courses of lectures. His *Opera omnia* (2 vols., Geneva, 1614) comprise the whole sphere of philosophy, which he treated in the spirit of a strict Aristotelianism, while many other Reformed theologians adopted the method and ideas of Petrus Ramus. His theological works, *Rhetorica ecclesiastica* (3d. ed., Hanau, 1606), and *Systema theologicum* (1602, and often; Eng. transl., *A Manuduction to Theology* [London, 1620?]) form only an appendix; and his dogmatic system is interesting chiefly on account of its method. Keckermann starts from a subjective point of view, from the enjoyment of God by man. The first book of the *Systema* treats of God as the highest aim of man. From the highest aim Keckermann proceeds analytically to the means for its attainment, which are knowledge of our misery and deliverance from it. Hence he distinguished two parts of theology, a *theologia pathologikē* (book ii., doctrines of the original state, fall, and sin), and a *theologia therapeutikē* (book iii., election, redemption, justification, and perfection). But he did not follow the consequences of his subjective starting-point beyond the structure of the external frame. Keckermann's attempt to transfer ethics from theology to philosophy is still worthy of note. (E. F. KARL MÜLLER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: M. Adam, *Vitae Germanorum philosophorum*, pp. 232 sqq., Frankfort, 1706; P. Bayle, *Dictionary Historical and Critical*, iii. 656, London, 1736; A. Schweizer, *Glaubenslehre der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche*, i. 98, ii. 151 sqq., Zurich, 1844; F. W. J. H. Gass, *Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik*, i. 408 sqq., Berlin, 1854.

KEDNEY, JOHN STEINFORT: Protestant Episcopal; b. at Bloomfield, N. J., Feb. 12, 1819. He was educated at Union College (A.B., 1838) and General Theological Seminary (1841). He was ordered deacon in 1841 and priested in 1843. After being a missionary in North Carolina from 1842 to 1845, he was rector of St. John's, Salem, N. J. (1847–52), Bethesda, Saratoga Springs, N. Y. (1852–59), Trinity, Society Hills, S. C. (1859–65), Trinity, Potsdam, N. Y. (1865–70), and Trinity, Camden, S. C. (1870–71). Since 1871 he has been professor of divinity in Seabury Divinity School, Faribault, Minn., although advancing years have compelled him to retire from active work. He has written: *Catawba River, and Other Poems* (New York, 1846); *The Beautiful and the Sublime* (1884); *Hegel's Æsthetics* (Chicago, 1886); *Christian Doctrine Harmonized* (2 vols., New York, 1888); *Mens Christi* (1890); and *Problems in Ethics* (1900).

KEDRON. See KIDRON.

KEENE, JAMES BENNETT: Church of Ireland, bishop of Meath; b. at Dublin Oct. 25, 1849. He studied at Trinity College, Dublin (B.A., 1871), and was ordered deacon in 1872 and ordained priest in the following year. He was curate of St. Matthias, Dublin (1872–74), diocesan curate of Meath (1874–77), Y. M. C. A. chaplain at Dublin (1877–1879), incumbent of Ballyboy (1879), and rector of Navan (1879–97). In 1897 he was consecrated bishop of Meath. He has been examining chaplain to the bishop of Meath (1885–94), prebendary of Tipper and canon of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin (1892–97), and rural dean of Skryne (1896–1897).

KEENER, JOHN CHRISTIAN: Methodist Episcopal (South) bishop; b. at Baltimore, Md., Feb. 7, 1819. He was graduated at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., in 1835, and, after being engaged in business for six years, entered the ministry of his denomination in 1841. For the next seven years he was pastor of churches in Alabama, and from 1848 to 1861 was pastor at New Orleans, being also presiding elder in 1858 and 1860. He was then superintendent of the chaplains attached to the Confederate Army west of the Mississippi until 1864, when he returned to New Orleans as presiding elder and editor of the *New Orleans Christian Advocate*. In 1870 he was elected bishop. In 1873 he established a Methodist Episcopal mission in Mexico. He has written: *The Post Oak Circuit* (Nashville, Tenn., 1857); *Studies of Bible Truths* (1899); and *The Garden of Eden and the Flood* (1900).

KEIL, kail, **KARL AUGUST GOTTLIEB:** German theologian; b. at Grossenhain (19 m. n.n.w. of Dresden), Saxony, Apr. 23, 1754; d. at Leipsic Apr. 22, 1818. Left an orphan at an early age, he was adopted by an uncle in Leipsic in 1763, and studied at the university of that city. In 1785 he was appointed assistant professor of philosophy; became assistant professor of theology two years later, and in 1792, upon the death of his former teacher, Professor Morus, he succeeded to the chair of theology. Keil may be regarded as a worthy representative of the Leipsic school of theology, which exercised a considerable influence during the latter part of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century. He published a *Lehrbuch der Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments* (Leipsic, 1810) and wrote a number of essays, which were collected by J. D. Goldhorn and published under the title *Keilii opuscula academica ad Novi Testamenti interpretationem grammatico-historicam et theologiae christianae origines pertinentia* (1820). From 1812 to 1817 Keil collaborated with Tzschirner in editing the *Analekten für das Studium der exegetischen und systematischen Theologie.*

(WOLDEMAR SCHMIDT†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His autobiography is included in Kreusler, *Beschreibung der Feierlichkeiten am Jubelfeste der Universität Leipzig, Dec. 4, 1809*, pp. 10–16, Leipsic, 1810.

KEIL, JOHANN FRIEDRICH KARL: German Protestant exegete; b. at Lauterbach near Ölsnitz (25 m. s.w. of Zwickau), Saxony, Feb. 26, 1807; d. at Rödlitz (8 m. s.e. of Glauchau), Saxony, May 5, 1888. He studied theology in Dorpat and Berlin, and in 1833 accepted a call to the theological faculty of Dorpat, where he labored for twenty-five years as docent and professor of Old- and New-Testament exegesis and Oriental languages. With Sartorius, Busch, later Philippi, Theodosius, Harnack and Kurtz, he educated for the Baltic provinces a generation of preachers who faithfully adhered to the confession of the Church. In 1859 he settled at Leipsic, where he devoted himself to literary work and to the practical affairs of the Lutheran Church. In 1887 he removed to Rödlitz, continuing there his literary activity until his death. He belonged to the strictly orthodox and conservative school of Hengstenberg. Ignoring almost entirely modern criticism, all his writings represent the view that the books of the Old and New Testaments are to be retained as the revealed word of God. Till the very last he regarded the modern development of German theological science as a passing phase of error. His chief work is the commentary on the Old Testament (4 vols. in 14, Leipsic, 1861–75; Eng. transl., 25 vols., Edinburgh, 1864–78), which he undertook with Franz Delitzsch. To this work he contributed commentaries on all the books from Genesis to Esther inclusive, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the minor prophets. He also published commentaries on Maccabees (Leipsic, 1875), Matthew (1877), Mark and Luke (1879), John (1881), Peter and Jude (1883), and Hebrews (1885). Other works are: *Der Tempel Salomos* (Dorpat, 1839); *Einleitung in die kanonischen Schriften des Alten Testaments* (Frankfort, 1853; 3d ed., 1873; Eng. transl., 2 vols., *Manual of Historico-Critical Introduction to . . . The O. T.*, Edinburgh, 1870); and *Handbuch der biblischen Archäologie* (1858–59; 2d. ed., 1875; Eng. transl., *Manual of Biblical Archæology*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1887–88). (W. J. A. KEIL.)

KEIM, kaim, **KARL THEODOR:** German historical theologian; b. at Stuttgart Dec. 17, 1825; d. at Giessen Nov. 17, 1878. He studied theology from 1843 to 1847 at Tübingen, devoting himself with special zeal to Oriental languages, and being influenced by F. C. Baur. He was tutor in the family of Count Sontheim, 1848–50; in 1850 continued his studies at Bonn; was lecturer at Tübingen, 1851–55; pastor in Esslingen, Württemberg, 1856–59. From 1860 to 1873 he was professor of historical theology at the University of Zürich, and from 1873 until shortly before his death, when ill health compelled his resignation, held a corresponding position at Giessen. The three years of preaching and pastoral labor at Esslingen, of which a memorial exists in *Freundesworte zur Gemeinde*, a collection of sermons (Stuttgart, 1861), show him to have been an eloquent and edifying preacher; but he was essentially a scholar. His chief importance for Evangelical theology lies in the sphere of history, especially in the investigation and scientific establishment of the historical foundations of Christian faith. After his first theological examination he published a prize essay, *Verhältnis der Christen in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten bis Konstantin zum römischen Reiche* (1848). The Revolution of 1848 caused him to leave Tübingen and return to his native city where he occupied himself first with the study of primitive Christianity, but soon turned to the history of the Reformation, especially in Swabia. In the latter field he published: *Die Reformation der Reichsstadt Ulm* (Stuttgart, 1851); *Schwäbische Reformationsgeschichte bis zum Augsburger Reichstag* (Tübingen, 1855); *Ambrosius Blarer* (Stuttgart, 1860); *Reformationsblätter der Reichsstadt Esslingen* (Esslingen, 1860). His historical investigations show scientific earnestness and great freedom from prejudice combined with a deep insight into the character of the Reformers as Thinkers upon the great religious and political questions of the time. At Zürich Keim devoted himself exclusively to the study of primitive Christianity. His special effort was to explain the development of the Christian Church from its apostolic origin up to its conquest over the old faith and the military power of the Roman Empire, and to give a scientific representation of the historic origin of our faith, the history of Jesus. The results along the first of these two lines are set forth especially in: *Die römischen Toleranzedikte für das Christentum und ihr geschichtlicher Wert* and *Bedenken gegen die Echtheit des hadrianischen Christenreskripts* (in *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1852, 1856); *Der Uebertritt Konstantins des Grossen zum Christentum* (Zürich, 1862); *Celsus' Wahres Wort* (ib. 1873); *Aus dem Urchristentum. Geschichtliche Untersuchungen in zwangloser Folge* (ib. 1878); and *Rom und das Christentum* (Berlin, 1881). In regard to the origin of our faith he wrote: *Die menschliche Entwickelung Jesu Christi* (Zürich, 1861), *Die geschichtliche Würde Jesu* (ib. 1864); he then republished the two just named, with a new lecture, under the caption, *Der geschichtliche Christus* (ib. 1865); then followed his greatest works, *Die Geschichte Jesu von Nazara in ihrer Verkettung mit dem Gesammtleben seines Volkes frei untersucht und ausführlich erklärt* (3 vols., ib. 1867–72; Eng. transl., *The History of Jesus of Nazareth*, 6 vols., London, 1873–82). In order to give his views a wider currency, Keim published *Die Geschichte Jesu nach den Ergebnissen heutiger Wissenschaft für weitere Kreise übersichtlich erzählt* (1874, 1875). Although he emphasized chiefly the human side in Christ, he can not be called a "Unitarian." While minimizing the miraculous element in Christianity, and in spite of the most concrete conception of the human limitations and development of its founder, he considered Jesus not only the greatest upon earth, but the Son "in whom the Father reveals himself." In his criticism of the historical sources he starts from Paul, whose epistles he regards as the firm basis for Evangelical history and the decisive test for judging all other events; and in this criticism he proceeds entirely according to objective points of view, unhampered by any dogmatic theory of inspiration. He rejected the fourth Gospel; among the synoptic Gospels he gave the preference to Matthew, which, according to him, originated as early as 68 and is distinguished by primitive simplicity and absence of preconceived notions, showing only slight traces of revision. Luke, according to Keim, obscured the simple representation of Matthew by his mediating Pauline standpoint. Mark wrote in the interest of a world-embracing universalism, changing the picture of Jesus in Matthew by omitting the most important speeches wherever they clash with his theory. Keim's work shows rare scientific solidity and deep penetration, and holds a position in the literature of the life of Jesus which can not be neglected even by those who do not share his rationalistic standpoint.

(H. Ziegler.)

KEIMANN, kai′mān **(KEYMANN), CHRISTIAN:** Saxon educator and hymn-writer; b. at Pankraz, near Gabel (50 m. n.n.e. of Prague), Bohemia, Feb. 27, 1607; d. at Zittau (50 m. e.s.e. of Dresden), Saxony, Jan. 13, 1662. He attended the gymnasium at Zittau and the University of Wittenberg (M.A., 1634), became associate rector of the gymnasium at Zittau in 1634 and was rector from 1639 till his death. His Easter hymn, *Meinen Jesum lass ich nicht* ("My Savior will I not forsake") has been extremely popular. Also the Christmas hymn, *Freude, Freude über Freude* ("O joy all joys excelling"), the Advent hymn, *Hosianna, Davids Sohn* ("Hosannah to the Son of David"), and the Passion hymn, *Sei gegrüsset, Jesu gütig* ("Hail to the Savior benign"), a paraphrase of *Salve, Jesu, summe bonus* by Bernard of Clairvaux, found much acceptance. On July 31, 1651, he was crowned imperial poet-laureate. He was also active as a pedagogical author. Religious education was fostered by his *Mnemosyne sacra* (Görlitz, 1646), and *Micae evangelicae* (Zittau, 1655); also by the collection of proverbs originally issued by Gerlach, *Sententiarum sacrarum centuriae duae* (Dresden, 1635). Of wide use in linguistic instruction were his *Tabulae declinationum* (Leipsic, 1649), and the *Enchiridion grammaticum Latinum* (Jena, 1649), and his books on his logic, rhetoric, and arithmetic were issued repeatedly. He also wrote a number of school dramas. Georg Mueller.

Bibliography: An early life is by C. Weis, *Memoria C. Keimanni*, Zittau, 1689; the modern one by H. J. Kömmel, *Christian Keimann*, ib. 1856; idem, in *ADB*, xv. 535–536. Consult further: O. E. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenlieds*, Stuttgart, 1867; A. F. W. Fischer, *Kirchenliederlexikon*, i. 195, 312, ii. 52, 248, 282, 449, Gotha, 1878–79; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 613–614. A large literature is indicated in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, x. 202.

KEITH, kîth, **ALEXANDER:** Clergyman of the Free Church of Scotland; b. at Keith Hall (11 m. n.w. of Aberdeen), Aberdeenshire, Nov. 30, 1791; d. at Buxton (160 m. n.w. of London), Derbyshire, Feb. 8, 1880. He studied at the Marischal College and University of Aberdeen (B.A., 1809; D.D., 1833), was licensed to preach in 1813, and was presented the same year to St. Cyrus, Kincardineshire, which he resigned in 1840 on account of ill health. In 1839 he visited Palestine as a member of a commission sent out by the Church of Scotland to inquire into the condition of the Jews, preparatory to the establishment of a mission among them. At the disruption of 1843 he joined the Free Church. He was the author of several works on prophecy, the best known being *Evidence of the Truth of the Christian Religion, Derived from the Literal Fulfilment of Prophecy* (Edinburgh, 1828; 40th ed., London, 1873). Other works are: *The Signs of the Times* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1832); *Demonstration of the Truth of Christianity* (1838); *The Harmony of Prophecy* (1851); and *The History and Destiny of the World* (London, 1861).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Black, *Jewish Missionary Travels to the Jews*, pp. 3 sqq., Newcastle, 1841; Hew Scott, *Fasti ecclesiae Scoticanae*, iii., 2, pp. 865, 881, London, 1871; *DNB*, xxx. 315–316.

KEITH, GEORGE: Scotch Quaker, afterward Anglican clergyman and missionary to America; b., probably in Aberdeenshire, 1639; d. at Edburton (20 m. e. of Chichester), Sussex, Mar. 27, 1716. After receiving the degree of M. A. from Marischal College, Aberdeen, he became tutor and chaplain in a noble family. He was designed for the Presbyterian ministry, but about 1664 adopted the tenets of the Quakers, and soon won a prominent position in the councils of the sect. He was intimately associated with Robert Barclay, George Fox, and William Penn. After having been frequently imprisoned for preaching in England, Keith emigrated to America about 1685, served for a time as surveyor-general in New Jersey, and settled in Philadelphia in 1689 as principal of a Friends' school. Subsequently he traveled in New England and defended the principles of the Quakers in controversy with Increase Mather and others. Having become involved in bitter disputes with other leaders of the sect, in 1692 Keith headed a faction called "Keithites," or "Christian Quakers." In 1694 he returned to England, where he was denounced by Penn as an apostate and dismissed from the society at the Annual Meeting of 1695. After preaching to his followers for five years at Turners' Hall, London, he united with the Established Church in 1700, and subsequently led several hundred Quakers to conform. From 1702 till 1704 he traveled in America as a missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. From 1706 till his death he was rector of Edburton, Sussex. He is said to have been one of the most scholarly and versatile men ever enrolled by the Quakers. The more important of his numerous writings are: *The Deism of William Penn and his Brethren* (London, 1699); *The Standard of the Quakers Examined* (1702); and *A Journal of Travels* (1706).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *DNB*, xxx. 318–321, where references to scattered notices are given.

KEITH-FALCONER, HONORABLE ION GRANT NEVILLE: Church of Scotland layman; the third son of the ninth earl of Kintore; b. in Edinburgh July 5, 1856; d. at Aden, Arabia, May 11, 1887. He was educated at Harrow Public School, and at Cambridge University, at both of which he distinguished himself not only by scholarship but by his bicycle-riding. He was appointed Lord Almoner's professor of Arabic at Cambridge, 1886. He also taught himself Pitman's system of shorthand and attained uncommon speed for a non-professional. He became deeply interested in evangelistic work in Cambridge and in London, and so his thoughts turned to making his remarkable Oriental learning available on the foreign field. With this in view he paid a visit to Aden to see for himself the prospects of a mission to the Mohammedans and being convinced that his lifework lay in that direction he laid aside his ambition as an Oriental scholar in England, and in 1886 went to Aden as a lay missionary of the Church of Scotland. There, however, he quickly succumbed to an attack of fever. He was destined to be of much more consequence in inciting others to labor for the conversion of Mohammedans and other non-Christians than as a worker himself. It was one of the sources of this influence that he was a nobleman of wealth and therefore one who could not be accused of sordid motives. He died too soon to do much in literature. Still his article on shorthand in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, his edition (1885) of *Kalilah and Dimnah*, otherwise known as the *Fables of Bidpai*, and some of his papers attracted wide attention.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: R. Sinker, *Memorials of . . . Keith-Falconer*, Cambridge, 1888.

KELLER (CELLARIUS), ANDREAS: Early German Evangelical; b. at Rottenburg (25 m. s.w. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, 1503; d. Sept. 18, 1562. He probably studied at Vienna. In the spring of 1524 he preached the Gospel with youthful fire in his native town and combated the papacy, and accepted in the same year a call to Strasburg as assistant at St. Peter's. In Dec., 1524, he became pastor at Wasselnheim, near Strasburg. By means of brief tracts he sought to promote the cause of the Gospel, and also wrote his now vanished catechism, *Bericht der Kinder zu Waselheim in Frag und Antwort gestellt* (Strasburg, 1530). In Sept., 1536, he became pastor at Wildberg, Württemberg, and later superintendent. In 1542 Strasburg wished to recall him, but he remained at Wildberg, reformed the neighboring cloister of Reuthin, and participated in the weightiest affairs of the State Church, e.g., in the memorial with reference to the attitude of the Evangelicals toward the council, 1543–44; and in the matter of advisement concerning the *Confessio Wirtembergica*, June, 1551. As a writer he now confined himself to German versions of foreign works. G. BOSSERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: L. M. Fischlin, *Memoria theologorum Wirtembergensium*, supplement, pp. 46, 376, Ulm, 1709–1710; C. F. Schnurrer, *Erläuterungen der wirtembergischen Kirchen- Reformations- und Gelehrten-Geschichte*, pp. 39, 209, Tübingen, 1798; T. W. Roehrich, *Geschichte der Reformation im Elsass*, i. 277, 375, ii. 19, Strasburg, 1830–32. Consult also: C. T. Keim, *Schwäbische Reformationsgeschichte*, pp. 24 sqq., Tübingen, 1855; *Württembergische Kirchengeschichte*, pp. 272 sqq., Stuttgart, 1892.

KELLER, LUDWIG KARL: German Reformed layman; b. at Fritzlar (16 m. s.w. of Cassel), Prussia, Mar. 28, 1849. He was educated at the universities of Leipsic and Marburg (Ph.D., 1873), and from 1874 to 1895 was connected with the state archives of Westphalia at Münster, where he was successively second assistant (1874–81), and director (1874–95). Since 1895 he has been privy state archivist at Berlin. Besides being editor of the *Monatsschrift der Comenius-Gesellschaft*, he has written the following works of theological interest: *Geschichte der Wiedertäufer und ihres Reichs zu Münster* (Münster, 1880); *Die Gegenreformation in Westfalen und am Niederrhein, Actenstücke und Erläuterungen* (3 parts, Leipsic, 1886–95); *Ein Apostel der Wiedertäufer* (biography of Hans Denk; 1882); *Die Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien in ihrem Zusammenhange dargestellt* (1885); *Die Waldenser und die deutschen Bibelübersetzungen* (1886); and *Johann von Staupitz und die Anfänge der Reformation* (1888).

KELLNER, KARL ADAM HEINRICH: German Roman Catholic; b. at Heiligenstadt (15 m. n.w. of Mühlhausen), Prussia, Aug. 26, 1837. He studied at the academy of Münster, the University of Tübingen, and the seminary of Treves, and was ordained to the priesthood in 1861. He was then vicar at Treves 1862–65, parish priest at Bitburg 1866–67, and professor of canon law in the theological seminary at Hildesheim from 1867 to 1874, when the institution was closed as a result of the Kulturkampf. In 1874 he was appointed professor of church history in the University of Bonn, and held this position until his retirement from active life in 1902. He has written *Buss- und Straffverfahrungen gegen Kleriker in den sechs ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten* (Treves, 1863); *Hellenismus und Christentum* (Cologne, 1866): *Ausgewählte Schriften Tertullians übersetzt* (2 vols., Kempten, 1870–72); *Verfassung, Lehramt und Unfehlbarkeit der Kirche* (1872); *Tertullians sämmtliche Schriften übersetzt* (2 vols., Cologne, 1882); and *Heortologie oder das Kirchenjahr und die Heiligenfeste in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart* (Freiburg, 1901). He also revised the eleventh volume of Rohrbacher's *Universalgeschichte der katholischen Kirche* (Münster, 1880).

KELLS, SYNOD OF: A synod convened in 1152 at Kells (38 m. n.w. of Dublin), by Eugenius III., for the purpose of reorganizing the Church of Ireland. It divided the country into four archbishoprics, established a hierarchy, introduced tithes and the Peter's-pence, acknowledged the papal supremacy, etc. See Celtic Church in Britain and Ireland, III., 2, § 5.

KELLY, THOMAS: Irish dissenting preacher and hymn-writer; b. at Kellyville (4 m. w. of Athy), County Queen's, July 13, 1769; d. there May 14, 1855. He was graduated at the University of Dublin and studied law in London, but took orders in the Established Church in 1792 and began to preach in Dublin. For his fervent Evangelical sermons he was soon inhibited by the archbishop from preaching in the diocese of Dublin. After preaching for a time in two unconsecrated buildings in the city, he became a dissenter and, from his ample means, erected chapels at Athy, Portarlington, Waterford, Wexford, and other places, where he continued to preach. His reputation rests upon his *Hymns on Various Passages of Scripture* (Dublin, 1804). The ninety-six hymns of the first edition grew to 765 in the seventh (1853), the last that appeared before his death. His best-known hymns are, "Come, see the place where Jesus lay," and "On the mountain's top appearing."

Bibliography: S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns*, pp. 206–207 et passim, New York, 1886; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 614–615.

KELLY, WILLIAM: Plymouth Brother; b. of Episcopalian parentage in the north of Ireland 1821; d. at Exeter, England, Mar. 27, 1906. He was early left fatherless, supported himself by teaching in the island of Sark, and joined the Plymouth Brethren (q.v.) in 1840. He retained a close connection with the Channel Islands for thirty years, residing in Guernsey, but for the latter half of his career his home was at Blackheath, London, S. E. He graduated with classical honors at Trinity College, Dublin, and by his writings established a reputation for sound scholarship and acquired distinction as an able controversialist. Besides aiding Tregelles in that eminent scholar's investigations as a Biblical textual critic, he himself published, in 1860, a critical edition of the Revelation of John, which earned a commendatory notice from Ewald in the Göttingen *Jahrbücher*. Such studies were carried on concurrently with the editing of a periodical entitled *The Prospect*, which gave way to *The Bible Treasury*, carried on by Kelly to the time of his death. This brought the editor into correspondence with such men as Dean Alford, Dr. Robert Scott the lexicographer, Principal Edwards, Professor Sanday, and other theologians. In his last days Archdeacon Denison was wont to speak of *The Bible Treasury* as the only religious magazine worth reading, so steadfast was the editor in rejection of what he believed to be Christ-dishonoring views of the Bible put forth by higher critics.

Kelly identified himself whole-heartedly with the body of doctrine developed by the late John Nelson Darby (q.v.), whose *Collected Writings* were edited by him. According to Neatby, he "was essentially the interpreter of Darby to the uninitiated." Kelly's own merits were, however, manifest alike in living as in written ministry. Spurgeon, judging by the latter, has applied to him, in the *Guide to Commentaries*, words of Goldsmith, "born for the universe, who narrowed his mind" by Darbyism. Although friction at last arose between them, the younger retained his veneration for the older man.

In the list of Kelly's writings will be found lectures on or formal expositions of all the books of the Bible. Kelly exercised considerable influence upon outside readers by his *Lectures on the New*

Testament Doctrine of the Holy Spirit (London, (1867); *On the Church of God* (10th ed., 1906); *On the Pentateuch* (1877); *On the Gospel of Matthew* (1868); and *On the Book of Revelation* (1861). "*In the Beginning*" (*Mosaic Cosmogony*), *Expositions of the Prophecies of Isaiah* and *the Gospel of John* (enlarged ed. by E. E. Whitfield, 1907); *The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistles of John;* a work on *God's Inspiration of the Scriptures*, and his last words on *Christ's Coming again* (in which he vindicated the originality of Darby in regard to the "Secret Rapture" after its impugnment by an American writer) are other works which warrant notice.

E. E. WHITFIELD.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. B. Neatby, *William Kelly as a Theologian*, in *Expositor*, 7 ser., no. 17.

KELSO, JAMES ANDERSON: Presbyterian; b. at Rawal Pindi (90 m. s.e. of Peshawur), India, June 6, 1873. He was graduated at Washington and Jefferson College in 1892, Western Theological Seminary in 1896, and studied in Berlin and Leipsic (Ph.D., 1902). He was tutor of Greek and Latin at Washington and Jefferson College 1892–1893, instructor in Hebrew in Western Theological Seminary 1897–1901, professor of Hebrew and Old-Testament literature in the same institution 1901–1909, and president since 1909. He is "an adherent of the confessional Theology of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A." He has written *Die Klagelieder, der masoretische Text und die Versionen* (Leipsic, 1901).

KEMPIS, THOMAS À.

I. Life, Minor Writings.
II. The Imitation of Christ.
III. Disputed Authorship of the "Imitation of Christ."
General Survey (§ 1).
Gersen's Claims (§ 2).
Gerson's Claims (§ 3).
Thomas à Kempis (§ 4).

I. Life, Minor Writings: Thomas à Kempis, German mystic and author of the "Imitation of Christ," was born at Kempen (40 m. n.w. of Cologne) in 1380 and died near Zwolle (52 m. e.n.e. of Amsterdam) in 1471. His paternal name was Hemerken or Hämmerlein, "little hammer." In 1395 he was sent to the school at Deventer conducted by the Brethren of the Common Life (q.v.). He became skilful as a copyist and was thus enabled to support himself. Later he was admitted to the Augustinian convent of Mount Saint Agnes near Zwolle, where his brother John had been before him and had risen to the dignity of prior. Thomas received priest's orders in 1413 and was made subprior 1429. The house was disturbed for a time in consequence of the pope's rejection of the bishop-elect of Utrecht, Rudolph of Diepholt; otherwise, Thomas' life was a quiet one, his time being spent between devotional exercises, composition, and copying. He copied the Bible no less than four times, one of the copies being preserved at Darmstadt in five volumes. In its teachings he was widely read, and his works abound in Biblical quotations, especially from the New Testament. His life is no doubt fitly characterized by the words under an old picture, first referred to by Francescus Tolensis: "In all things I sought quiet and found it not save in retirement and in books." A monument was dedicated to his memory in the presence of the archbishop of Utrecht in St. Michael's Church, Zwolle, Nov. 11, 1897.

Thomas à Kempis belonged to the school of mystics who were scattered along the Rhine from Switzerland to Strasburg and Cologne and in the Netherlands. He was a follower of Geert Groote and Florentius Radewijns, the founders of the Brethren of the Common Life. His writings are all of a devotional character and include tracts and meditations, letters, sermons, a life of St. Lydewigis, a Christian woman who remained steadfast under a great stress of afflictions, and biographies of Groote, Radewijns, and nine of their companions. Works similar in contents to the "Imitation of Christ" and pervaded by the same spirit are his prolonged meditation on the life and blessings of the Savior and another on the Incarnation. Both of these works overflow with adoration for Christ.

II. The Imitation of Christ: The work which has given Thomas à Kempis universal fame in the Western churches is the *De imitatione Christi.* It is the pearl of all the writings of the mystical German-Dutch school of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and with the "Confessions" of Augustine and Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* it occupies a front rank, if not the foremost place, among useful manuals of devotion, after the Bible. Protestants and Roman Catholics alike join in giving it praise. The Jesuits give it an official place among their "exercises." John Wesley and John Newton put it among the works that influenced them at their conversion. General Gordon carried it with him to the battlefield. Few books have had so extensive a circulation. The number of counted editions exceeds 2,000; and 1,000 different editions are preserved in the British Museum. The Bullingen collection, donated to the city of Cologne in 1838, contained at the time 400 different editions. De Backer (*Essai*, ut inf.) enumerates 545 Latin and about 900 French editions. Originally written in Latin, a French translation was made as early as 1447, which still remains in manuscript. The first printed French copies appeared at Toulouse 1488. The earliest German translation was made in 1434 by J. de Bellorivo and is preserved in Cologne. The editions in German began at Augsburg in 1486. The first English translation (1502) was by William Atkinson and Margaret, mother of Henry VII., who did the fourth book. Translations appeared in Italian (Venice, 1488, Milan 1489), Spanish (Seville, 1536), Arabic (Rome, 1663), Armenian (Rome, 1674), Hebrew (Frankfort, 1837), and other languages. Corneille produced a poetical paraphrase in French in 1651.

The "Imitation of Christ" derives its title from the heading of the first book, *De imitatione Christi et contemptu omnium vanitatum mundi.* It consists of four books and seems to have been written in meter and rime, a fact first announced by K. Hirsche in 1874. The four books are not found in all the manuscripts, nor are they arranged invariably in the same order. The work is a manual of devotion intended to help the soul in its communion with God and the pursuit of holiness. Its sentences are statements, not arguments, and are pitched in the highest key of Christian experience. It was meant for monastics and recluses. Behind and within all its reflections runs the council of self-renunciation. The life of Christ is presented as the highest study possible to a mortal. His teachings far excel all the teachings of the saints. The book gives counsels to read the Scriptures, statements about the uses of adversity, advice for submission to authority, warnings against temptation and how to resist it, reflections about death and the judgment, meditations upon the oblation of Christ, and admonitions to flee the vanities of the world. Christ himself is more than all the wisdom of the schools and lifts the mind to perceive more of eternal truth in a moment of time than a student might learn in the schools in ten years. Excellent as these counsels are, they are set in the minor key and are especially adapted for souls burdened with care and sorrow and sitting in darkness. They present only one side of the Christian life, and in order to compass the whole of it they must be supplemented by counsels for integrity, bravery and constancy in the struggle of daily existence to which the vast mass of mankind, who can not be recluses, are called. The charge has even been made that the piety commended by the "Imitation" is of a selfish monkish type. It was written by a monk and intended for the convent; it lays stress on the passive qualities and does not touch with firmness the string of active service in the world. That which makes it acceptable to all Christians is the supreme stress it lays upon Christ and the possibility of immediate communion with him and God. The references to medieval mistakes or superstitions are confined to several passages, viz., the merit of good works and transubstantiation (iv. 2), purgatory (iv. 9), and the worship of saints (i. 13, ii. 9, iii. 6, 59). In other works, however, Thomas à Kempis exalts Mary as the queen of heaven, the efficient mediatress of sinners, and to her all should flee as to a mother. She should be invoked. He also gives prayers to Mary (cf. the *De tabernaculis*, and *Hortus rosarum*, Pohl's ed., ut inf., i. also iii. 357, vi. 219, 235 sqq.).

III. Disputed Authorship of the "Imitation of Christ": To some extent national sentiments have entered into the controversy which for 300 years has been waged over the authorship of the "Imitation," France and Italy contending for the honor of furnishing the author as against the Netherlands.

1. General Survey.

The weight of opinion is in favor of Thomas à Kempis. Among the recent treatments of the subject are: K. Hirsche, *Prolegomena zu einer neuen Ausgabe der Imitatio Christi* (Berlin, 1873, 1884, 1894), containing a copy of the Latin text of the manuscript dated 1441; C. Wolfsgruber, *Giovanni Gersen, sein Leben und sein Werk De Imitatione Christi* (Augsburg, 1880); L. Santini, *I diritti di Tommaso da Kempis* (2 vols., Rome, 1879–81); S. Kettlewell, *Authorship of the "De Imitatione Christi"* (London, 1877; 2d ed., 1884); V. Becker, *L'Auteur de l'Imitation et les documents Neérlandais* (The Hague, 1882); also *Les derniers traveaux sur l'auteur de l'Imitation* (Brussels, 1889); H. S. Denifle, *Kritische Bemerkungen zur Gersen-Kempis Frage*, in *ZKT* (1882–1883); O. A. Spitzen, *Thomas a Kempis als schrijver der navolging* (Utrecht, 1880), also *Nouvelle défense en réponse du Denifle* (1884); F. X. Funk, *Gerson und Gersen*, also *Der Verfasser der Nachfolge Christi*, both in his *Abhandlungen* (ii. 373–444, Paderborn, 1899); P. E. Puyol, *Descriptions bibliographiques des manuscrits et des principales éditions du livre De Imitatione Christi* (Paris, 1898); *Paléographie, classement, généalogie du livre de Imitatione Christi* (1898), and *L'Auteur du livre De Imitatione Christi* (2 vols., 1899–1900); G. Kentenich, *Die Handschriften der Imitatio und die Autorschaft des Thomas*, in *ZKG*, xxiii. 18 sqq., xxiv. 504 sqq.; J. E. G. De Montmorency, *Thomas à Kempis, his Age and his Book*, New York, 1906; and L. Schulze, in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xix. 719–733. For other works, see the bibliography below. Pohl gives a list of thirty-five persons to whom the authorship has at one time or another been ascribed, among them Thomas à Kempis, Jean Charlier de Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris, Giovanni Gersen, the reputed abbot of Vercelli, Italy, St. Bernard, Bonaventura, David of Augsburg, Johann Tauler, Heinrich Suso, and even Innocent III., the last chiefly on account of the second part of the title of the "Imitation," recalling Innocent's work on the contempt of the world. The only claimants worthy of attention are Thomas à Kempis, the Chancellor Gerson (d. 1429), and the Abbot Giovanni Gersen, who is said to have lived about 1230. The uncertainty arises from several facts: (1) a number of manuscripts and printed editions of the fifteenth century have no note of authorship; (2) the rest are divided between these three men and St. Bernard; and (3) the manuscript copies show important divergences. The matter has been made more perplexing by the forgery of names and dates in manuscripts of the "Imitation" since the controversy began, these forgeries, however, being largely in the interest of Gerson and Gersen. A reason for the absence of an author's name in so many of the manuscripts is to be found, if Thomas à Kempis was indeed the author, in his wishing to remain unknown according to his maxim *Ama nesciri*, Love to be unknown. Of the Latin editions belonging to the fifteenth century, Pohl gives twenty-eight as accredited to Gerson, twelve to Thomas, two to St. Bernard, and six anonymous. Or, to follow Funk (p. 426), forty editions of that century ascribed the work to Gerson, eleven to Thomas, two to St. Bernard, one to Gersen, and two are anonymous. Spitzen gives fifteen as ascribed to Thomas à Kempis. Most of the editions containing Gerson's name were printed in France; a few were issued in Italy and Spain. The editions of the sixteenth century show a change. There, thirty-seven Latin editions ascribe the authorship to Thomas à Kempis, twenty-five to Gerson. As for the manuscripts, all of them dated before 1450, the dates of which are probably genuine, were written in Germany or the Netherlands. The oldest is included in a codex preserved since 1826 in the royal library of Brussels. The codex contains nine other writings of Thomas besides the "Imitation." It is dated 1441, containing the note, in Latin, *finitus et completus MCCCCXLI per manus fratris Th. Kempensis in Monte S. Agnetis prope Zwollis*, "Finished and completed in 1441 by the hands of brother Thomas à Kempis, at Mount Saint Agnes near Zwolle" (cf. Pohl, ii. 461). If this be a genuine writing the manuscript is an autographic copy. The text of the Imitation is written on older paper than the other documents comprised in the codex. It also contains corrections which are found in the first Dutch translation of 1420. For these reasons Spitzen, Funk and others place this text of the Imitation between 1416 and 1420.

2. Gersen's Claims.

The literary controversy over the composition began in 1604 when Dom Pedro Manriquez, in a work on the Lord's Supper issued at Milan, declared the "Imitation" to be older than Bonaventura, basing his statement upon an alleged quotation from it by that schoolman. In 1606 Bellarmine in his *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* stated it was already in existence in 1260. About the same time the Jesuit Rossignoli found in a convent at Arona near Milan a manuscript without date bearing the name of the Abbot Giovanni Gersen as its author. The house had at one time belonged to the Benedictines, and the Benedictine Cajetan, secretary of Paul V., defended the abbot's claim in his *Gersen restitutus* (Rome, 1614) and later in his *Apparatus ad Gersenem restitutum.* Cajetan also announced the discovery of a manuscript in Venice containing the statement, "Not Johannes Gerson but Johannes abbot of Vercelli wrote this book." Gersen's claims were attacked by the Augustinian Heribert Rosweyde in his *Vindiciae Kempenses* (Antwerp, 1617), and so cogently that Bellarmine withdrew his statement. The Congregation of Propaganda, urged by the Benedictines, gave permission for the book to be printed in Rome and elsewhere under the name of Gerson. A revival of the assertion of the Italian's authorship was started by the Piedmontese nobleman, Gregory, in his *Istoria della Vercellese letteratura* (Turin, 1819). He was confirmed in his view by a manuscript of the "Imitation" purchased in Paris in 1830, containing the statement that in 1550 it was the property of an Italian Girolamo d'Avogadri. The family Avogadri had its ancestral seat near Vercelli, and an old *diarium*, which Gregory found, contained under the date of Feb. 5, 1347, the record of the transmission of a book called the "Imitation of Christ." Gregory issued his manuscript (Paris, 1833), and in his *Histoire du livre de l'Imitatione* (Paris, 1842) he defended the alleged authorship of the abbot of Vercelli. He was thoroughly answered by J. B. Malou, bishop of Bruges, in his *Recherches historiques et critiques sur le véritable auteur du livre de l'Imitation Christi* (Tournay, 1848; 3d ed., Paris, 1858). The Italian origin again found a vigorous advocate in Coelestin Wolfsgruber (ut sup.). The abbot's claim has at present little or no standing; and it has been shown that the details of his life are simple conjectures. Funk pronounces him a fiction. A monument was dedicated to the Italian's memory at Vercelli in 1884.

3. Gerson's Claims.

After the decision of the Congregation of Propaganda the matter of the authorship was taken up with spirit in France. A careful examination of the manuscript copies of the Imitation was made, but with uncertain result. Richelieu in his splendid edition of 1640 issued the work without name of author, but in 1652 the French Parliament ordered the work issued under the name of Thomas à Kempis. Mabillon made a fresh examination of manuscripts at three gatherings (1671, 1674, 1687), the case being decided against Thomas à Kempis. Dupin, in his edition of Gerson's works (cf. 2d ed., 1728, vol. i., pp. lix.–lxxxiv.), made a comparison of Gerson's writings with the "Imitation" and showed that it was possible that Gerson was the author of the latter, but closed his discussion with the statement that it is not possible to come to a final decision between the claims of Gersen, Gerson, and Thomas à Kempis. The controversy again broke out with the edition of 1724 made by the Benedictines Erhard and Mezler, who ascribed the authorship to Gerson as also did Vollardt in his edition (Paris, 1758). A strong reply was made by the Augustinian E. Amort of Polling, Bavaria, who defended with much learning the claims of Thomas à Kempis in his *Informatio de statu controversiae* (Augsburg, 1728), and especially in his *Scutum Kempense seu vindiciae IV librorum de Imitatione Christi* (Cologne, 1728). The editions of De Sacy (Paris, 1853) and Caro (ib., 1875) leave the authorship undecided. After the claims of Thomas à Kempis seemed to be very generally acknowledged, still another stage in the controversy was opened by P. E. Puyol (1898, ut sup.), who gave a description of 348 manuscripts and annotated the variations between fifty-seven of them. His conclusion was that the text of the Italian manuscript is the more simple and consequently the older. He has been followed by Kentenich; Puyol's work may lead to a more careful comparison of the texts of the Imitation. The claim that Gerson is the author of the "Imitation of Christ" is based upon editions and manuscripts made before 1500 bearing his name and upon probabilities drawn from Gerson's style and mystical temper of thought. The manuscript upon which chief stress used to be laid is at Valenciennes and is dated 1462. It contains Gerson's sermons on the Passion of Christ and a book called *Internelle Consolation.* Onésime Leroy in his *Études sur les mystères et sur le divers manuscrits de Gerson* (Paris, 1837), and in his *Corneille et Gerson dans l'Imitation de Jesu Christi* (Paris, 1841), drew the conclusion that all these works must be by the same author. It was later shown from a manuscript in Amiens dated 1447 that the work *Internelle Consolation* was a translation of the Imitation made by Hesden from the Latin. The similarity between Gerson's writings and the "Imitation" was amply refuted by J. B. Schwab in his life of Gerson (Würzburg, 1858, pp. 782–786). Gerson in his judgment would have required the endowment of a wholly new tongue to write the work. The first edition of Gerson's works (1483) does not contain it. Again, the lists of the chancellor's writings given by his brother John (1423) and by Canesius (1429) do not mention it. The author was by his own statement a monk (iv. 5, 11, iii. 56), and Gerson was not a monk. The attachment of Gerson's name to the book can be explained only by the consideration that the "Imitation" first went forth anonymously, and Gerson's mystical treatises gave to French editors and copyists the supposed cue to its authorship.

4. Thomas à Kempis.

The claim of à Kempis has many arguments in its favor. Jan Busch in his *Chronicon Windeshemense,* written in 1464, seven years before the death of Thomas à Kempis, expressly states that Thomas wrote the "Imitation." This statement might be considered sufficient of itself were it not for the fact that the so-called Gaesdoncker Codex of the *Chronicon* does not contain this statement. Caspar of Pforzheim, who made his German translation in 1448, says the work was written by "a devoted father, Master Thomas, a canon regular." Hermann Rheyd, who met Thomas at the chapter of Windesheim in 1454, speaks of him as the author. John Wessel, who spent some time with Thomas, was according to his early biographer attracted by the book at Windesheim. Funk gives thirteen dated manuscripts written before 1500 ascribing the "Imitation" to Thomas à Kempis. The original Brussels Codex of 1441 has already been referred to above. Its date is accepted by Hirsche, Pohl, Funk, Schulze, and others; and the conclusion drawn is that the manuscript of the "Imitation" it contains was written before 1420. The date 1441 has recently been disputed as ungenuine by Puyol and Kentenich on the basis of its divergences from other texts by the way of additions and also the conclusion. A second manuscript in Louvain is also subscribed as autographic and seems to be nearly as old (cf. Pohl, vi. 456). Another manuscript preserved in Brussels has the date 1425 and states that Thomas was the author. The *Codex Magdalenus* in Oxford, dated 1438, strangely gives the work under the title *De musica ecclesiastica,* the title of a work by Walter Hylton, an English mystic. Of printed editions of the fifteenth century, at least twelve present Thomas as the author, beginning with the Augsburg edition of 1472. Finally, in style and contents the "Imitation" agrees closely with other writings of Thomas à Kempis; and the flow of thought is altogether similar to that of the *Meditatio de incarnatione.* Spitzen has made it seem probable that the author was acquainted with the writings of Jan van Ruysbroeck and other mystics of the Netherlands. Funk has brought out the references to ecclesiastical customs which fit the book into the early part of the fifteenth century better than into an earlier time. Scholars like Schwab, Hirsche, Pohl, Schulze, and Funk (and also the Italian Santini) agree that the claims of Thomas à Kempis are almost beyond dispute. On the other hand, Denifle cleared the deck of all suggested names and ascribed the work to some unknown canon regular of the Netherlands. Karl Müller in a brief note (*Kirchengeschichte,* ii. 122) pronounces the theory of the Thomas authorship to be "more than uncertain"; and Loofs (*Dogmengeschichte,* 4th ed., p. 633) expresses substantially the same judgment. In addition to the historic considerations for the Thomas authorship the philosophical consideration certainly has weight, that no sufficient reason can be given why the name of Thomas à Kempis should have been attached to the book if he did not write it. D. S. SCHAFF.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The first ed. of the *Opera* by N. Ketelaer and G. de Leempt appeared at Utrecht, 1473 (contained fifteen writings, not including the "Imitation"). Others are by P. Danhassor, Nuremberg, 1494 (includes twenty compositions); J. Badius, Antwerp, 1520, 1521, 1523; G. Dupuyherbault, with *Vita* by J. B. Ascensius, Paris, 1549; G. Putherbeus, Antwerp, 1574; H. Sommalius, 3 vols., ib. 1599, 5th ed., Douai, 1635 (regarded as the best until the next to be mentioned); M. J. Pohl, to be in 8 vols., vols. i.–v., Freiburg, 1903 sqq. On the Imitation there is a discussion of the literature by R. P. A. de Backer, *Essai bibliographique sur le livre De imitatione Christi,* Liége, 1864. The editions of the work are past counting. Among them may be singled out: the first Latin ed., Augsburg, 1472 (bound up with a copy of Jerome's *De vir. ill.,* and writings of Augustine and Thomas Aquinas), cf. *Facsimile Reproduction of the First Edition of 1471 with Historical Introduction by C. Knox-Little,* London, 1894. Of the many English translations may be noted: the first, by W. Atkinson and the Princess Margaret, mother of King Henry VII., London, 1502; reprinted ib. 1828, new ed. by J. K. Ingram, ib. 1893; *The Imitation of Christ, Being the Autograph MS. of Thomas a Kempis, De imitatione Christi, Reproduced in Facsimile from the Original Preserved in the Royal Library at Brussels, with Introduction by C. Ruelens,* London, 1879; *The Imitation of Christ, now for the First Time Set forth in Rythm and Sentences, with Preface by Canon Liddon,* ib. 1889; *Meditations on the Life of Christ . . . Translated and Edited . . . by Archdeacon Wright . . . and . . . S. Kettlewell, with a Preface by the Latter,* Oxford, 1892; *The Imitation of Christ; Translation by Canon W. Benham, with 12 Photogravures after Celebrated Paintings,* ib. 1905; J. H. Srawley, *The Imitation of Christ or the Ecclesiastical Music,* Cambridge, 1908.

On the life of Thomas the fundamental source is J. Busch, *Chronicon Windeshemense,* ed. H. Rosweyde, Antwerp, 1621, and K. Grube, Halle, 1886; with which should be used H. Rosweyde, *Chronicon Mt. S. Agnetis,* Antwerp, 1615, ed. *cum Rosweydii vindiciis Kempensibus,* ib. 1622. Consult further: Vol. i. of the *Opera* by Pohl (ut sup.) contains a discussion of the life and writings; B. Bähring, *Thomas à Kempis der Prediger der Nachfolge Christi,* Leipsic, 1872; S. Kettlewell, *Thomas à Kempis and the Brethren of the Common Life,* 2 vols., London, 1882, abridged ed., 1885; F. R. Cruise, *Thomas à Kempis, with Notes of a Visit to the Scenes in which his Life was Spent, with Some Account of the Examination of his Relics,* ib. 1887; L. A. Wheatley, *Story of the Imitation of Christ,* ib. 1891; Röring, *Thomas à Kempis, Zijne voorgangers en zijne tijdgenooten,* Utrecht, 1902; C. Bigg, *Wayside Sketches in Ecclesiastical History,* ib. 1906; *KL,* viii. 1555–59.

KEN (KENN), THOMAS: Bishop of Bath and Wells; b. at Great (or Little) Berkhamsted, Hertfordshire, July, 1637; d. at Longleat (22 m. w.n.w. of Salisbury), Wiltshire, Mar. 19, 1711. He studied at Winchester College, and at New College, Oxford (B.A., 1661; M. A., 1664; D.D., 1679), was fellow of New College 1657–66, and tutor in 1661. In 1665 he went back to Winchester, became chaplain to Bishop George Morley, and took gratuitous charge of the parish of St. John in the Soke. He was elected fellow of Winchester in 1666, and collated to a prebend at Winchester in 1669. He was rector of Brightstone, Isle of Wight, 1667–69, and of East Woodhay, Hampshire, 1669–72. With the exception of a visit to Rome in 1675, he again resided at Winchester, 1672–79, resuming charge of the parish of St. John in the Soke. In 1679 he went to The Hague as chaplain to Mary, the king's sister, wife of William II. of Orange, but returned to England in the autumn of 1680 and became chaplain to Charles II. In the summer of 1683, when the court was about to visit Winchester, he refused to allow his prebendal house to be appropriated for the use of Nell Gwyn. Charles respected his attitude in the matter, admired his courage, and in Nov., 1684, gave him the bishopric of Bath and Wells. He was consecrated Jan. 25, 1685. In the mean time he had sailed for Tangier in Aug., 1683, as chaplain to Lord Dartmouth, commander of the English fleet, returning to England in Apr., 1684. In Feb., 1685, he attended the king on his deathbed, gave him absolution, and vainly urged him to receive the sacrament. He was loyal to James II., but in May, 1688, refused to publish the second Declaration of Indulgence. He was one of the seven bishops thrown into the Tower June 8, 1688. With his six brethren he was tried on June 29, and acquitted and liberated June 30. For refusing to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary he was deprived of his see in Apr., 1691. He then retired to the home of his friend, Lord Weymouth, Longleat, Wiltshire, where he resided chiefly during the remainder of his life. He was not in sympathy with the more violent non-jurors, and opposed the clandestine consecrations of 1694. For joining the other deprived bishops in a " charitable recommendation " on behalf of the deprived clergy, he was summoned before the council in Apr., 1696, but was quickly set at liberty. In June, 1704, Queen Anne granted him a treasury pension of £200, he having declined, in 1702, her offer to reinstate him in his see.

In early English hymnology Ken occupies an important place. The morning hymn, " Awake, my soul, and with the sun," and the evening hymn, " Glory to thee, my God, this night " (or, as it is usually written, " All praise to Thee, my God, this night "), are among the best hymns in the language, and are known wherever English is spoken. Each of these, as also the midnight hymn, " My God, now I from sleep awake," ends with the familiar doxology, " Praise God from whom all blessings flow." He wrote these hymns for the boys of Winchester College, and first printed them in the 1695 edition of his *Manual for the Use of Winchester Scholars* (London, 1674; printed by S. P. C. K., 1880), as *Hymns for Morning, Evening, and Midnight* (ed. R. Palmer, 1898). Owing to their length these three hymns have been rearranged in modern hymnals, and divided into about a dozen separate hymns. Other works by Ken are: *An Exposition of the Church Catechism, or the Practice of Divine Love* (London, 1685; new ed., 1849); *Prayers for the Use of all Persons who come to the Baths for Cure* (1692; S. P. C. K., 1898); and the posthumous *Hymns for All the Festivals of the Year* (1721; new eds., 1868, etc.). Selections from his devotional writings have been frequently published under various titles. W. Hawkins published his *Works* (4 vols., 1721), including only poetical compositions. J. T. Round collected his *Prose Works* (1838), which have been reedited and augmented by W. Benham (1889; new ed., 1899).

Ken was one of the best and most fearless preachers of his time, and a man of rare piety and sweetness of spirit. He was anxious to do good; and during his incumbency of the see of Bath and Wells he devoted his revenues to charitable purposes. On coming into the possession of £4,000 in 1686 he gave the greater part of it to the fund for Huguenot refugees. He was an accomplished linguist, and a musician, as well as a poet. He was accustomed to sing his hymns to his own accompaniment on the lute. The reverence felt for Ken was revived by the Oxford Movement. In *Tract* 85 (London, 1836) Newman gives a form of service for Mar. 21, the day of Ken's burial.

Bibliography: The (Poetical) *Works* appeared ed., with a *Life*, W. Hawkins (Ken's great-nephew), 4 vols., London, 1721, and his *Prose Works and Letters*, ed. J. T. Round, ib. 1838, also containing the *Life* by Hawkins (which is the original authority). Besides this, consult the *Life* by a layman (J. L. Anderdon), 2 vols., London, 1851–54 (admirable); E. H. Plumptre, ib. 1890; and F. A. Clarke, ib. 1896. Valuable material is also found in T. Lathbury, *Hist. of the Nonjurors*, ib. 1862; J. Evelyn, *Diary*, ed. W. Bray, vols. ii.–iii., passim, ib. 1879; S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns*, pp. 49–50, New York, 1886; J. H. Overton, *The Church in England*, vol. ii. passim, ib. 1897; W. H. Hutton, *The English Church (1625–1714)*, passim, ib. 1903; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 616–622 (valuable); *DNB*, xxx. 399–404.

KENDRICK, ASAHEL CLARK: Baptist; b. at Poultney, Vt., Dec. 7, 1809; d. at Rochester, N. Y., Oct. 21, 1895. He was educated at Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. (B.A., 1831), and after being professor of Greek in Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y., from 1832 to 1850, occupied a similar chair at the University of Rochester until his death. He was also professor of Hebrew and New-Testament interpretation in Rochester Theological Seminary from 1865 to 1868, and from 1852 to 1854 studied and traveled in Europe, especially in Greece. Although ordained to the Baptist ministry, he never held a pastorate. From 1871 to 1881 he was a member of the New Testament Company of the Anglo-American Bible Revision Committee. He was the author of: *Life and Letters of Mrs. Emily C. Judson* (New York, 1860); *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Philadelphia, 1889); and *The Moral Conflict of Humanity, and other Papers* (1894). He likewise collaborated on several biographies, and revised the translation of H. Olshausen's *Biblical Commentary on the New Testament* (6 vols., New York, 1836–58), besides translating C. B. Moll's commentary on Hebrews for the American Lange commentary (1868) and H. A. W. Meyer's commentary on John (1884).

KENDRICK, JOHN MILLS: Protestant Episcopal missionary bishop of Arizona and New Mexico; b. at Gambier, O., May 14, 1836. He was graduated at Marietta College, Marietta, O., in 1856, studied law, and was admitted to the New York bar, but feeling himself drawn toward the Church, entered the theological seminary connected with Kenyon College, Gambier, O. He interrupted his studies to serve in the Union Army during the Civil War, and rose to be assistant adjutant-general. Graduating from the theological seminary in 1864, he was ordered deacon in the same year, and advanced to the priesthood in 1865. He served as a missionary for two years at Put-in-Bay, O., and was then rector of St. Andrew's, Fort Scott, Kan. (1867–69), St. Paul's, Leavenworth, Kan. (1869–1875), and the Church of the Good Shepherd, Columbus, O (1875–78). In 1878–89 he was a general diocesan missionary, and for five years of this period was superintendent of city missions in Columbus. In 1889 he was consecrated missionary bishop of Arizona and New Mexico.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 71, New York, 1895.

KENITES. See CAIN.

KENIZZITES. See CALEB.

KENNEDY, ARCHIBALD ROBERT STIRLING: Church of Scotland; b. at Whitehills (2 m. w. of Banff), Banffshire, Scotland, Dec. 21, 1859. He studied at the universities of Aberdeen (M.A., 1879), Glasgow (B.D., 1883), Göttingen (1883), and Berlin (1883–85), and in 1885–87 was fellow of Glasgow University. He was professor of Hebrew and cognate languages in the University of Aberdeen 1887–94, and since 1894 has been professor of Hebrew and Semitic languages in the University of Edinburgh. He prepared the English editions of the Hebrew, Syriac, Assyrian, and Arabic grammars in the *Porta Linguarum Orientalium* (London, 1885–95), and has edited Exodus, Joshua, and Judges in *The Temple Bible*, besides writing the commentary on Samuel for *The Century Bible* (1905).

KENNETT (KENNET), WHITE: Bishop of Peterborough; b. at Dover Aug. 10, 1660; d. at Westminster Dec. 19, 1728. He studied at the Westminster School and at St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford (B.A., 1682; M.A., 1684; B.D., 1694; D.D., 1700), and was vicar of Ambrosden, Oxfordshire, 1685–1700. As a student he had been an admirer of James II., but afterward he became an open supporter of the Revolution and a zealous Whig partizan. In 1691 he returned to Oxford as tutor and vice-principal at St. Edmund's Hall, and gave a considerable impetus to the study of British antiquities. He was rector of St. Botolph, Aldgate, London, 1700-07, and then rector at St. Mary, Aldermary, London. In 1701 he became prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral, archdeacon of Huntingdon, and one of the original members of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. In the same year he entered into a famous controversy with Francis Atterbury (q.v.) regarding the rights of convocation. In 1708 he was collated to a prebend in Lincoln and installed dean of Peterborough. Through the influence of his friend Charles Trimnell, bishop of Norwich, he was made bishop of Peterborough in 1718, despite the fact that he was a Low-churchman and had taken the side of Benjamin Hoadly (q.v.) in the Bangorian controversy. Kennett's most important works are: *Parochial Antiquities . . . of Oxford and Bucks* (Oxford, 1695; greatly enlarged from the author's manuscript notes, 2 vols., 1818); the third volume of *A Complete History of England* (3 vols., London, 1706), covering the period from Charles I. to Queen Anne; and the unfinished *Register and Chronicle, Ecclesiastical and Civil . . . from the Restoration of King Charles II.* (vol. i., 1728).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: An anonymous *Life of . . . W. Kennet* appeared, London, 1730; also *Remarks on Some Passages in the Life of Dr. Kennett* (by J. Sharp), ib. 1730. Consult: A. à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, iv. 792, 1003, London, 1820; *DNB*, xxxi. 2–6; J. H. Overton, *Church in England*, London, 1897; W. H. Hutton, *The English Church (1625–1714)*. ib. 1903.

KENNICOTT, BENJAMIN: Biblical scholar; b. at Totnes (22 m. s.s.w. of Exeter), Devonshire, Apr. 4, 1718; d. at Oxford Aug. 18, 1783. He spent seven years in the grammar-school and became master of the charity school at Totnes, and subsequently studied at Wadham and Exeter colleges, Oxford (B.A., 1747; M.A., 1750; B.D. and D.D., 1761). He was fellow of Exeter College 1747–71, Whitehall preacher 1753, vicar of Culham, Oxfordshire, 1753–83, chaplain to the bishop of Oxford 1766, Radcliffe librarian at Oxford 1767–1783, canon of Westminster Abbey 1770, canon of Christ Church, Oxford, 1770–83, and held the vicarage of Menheniot, Cornwall, 1771–81. His life was spent chiefly in the study of the Hebrew texts of the Old Testament. After the publication of *The State of the Printed Text of the Old Testament* (2 vols., Oxford, 1753–59; Latin transl., Leipsic, 1756–65), he was induced by Thomas Secker to undertake a collation of the text. For this work the sum of about ten thousand pounds was raised by subscription, and many scholars were employed, both at home and abroad. During the progress of the undertaking (1760–69) ten annual reports were published, which were afterward collected in one volume (Oxford, 1770). The result of these labors was Kennicott's Hebrew Bible, *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum variis lectionibus* (2 vols., 1776–80). To the second volume he appended a *Dissertatio generalis* (also separately, Oxford, 1780; Brunswick, 1783), giving an account of the manuscripts of the Old Testament. The text is that of Van der Hooght, but without points, and the various readings are placed at the bottom of the page. The number of manuscripts collated was 615. Kennicott has been criticised for his preference for the Samaritan Pentateuch, for his neglect of the Massorah, for his disregard of the vowel points, and for occasional inaccuracy. A considerable literature was issued embodying these and other objections, to which Kennicott and his friends made answer. His *Letter to a Friend Occasioned by a French Pamphlet* (issued anonymously, 1772) answers a French attack, and his *Contra ephemeridum Goettigensium criminationes* (1782) replies to German criticisms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1747, 1768, 1771, 1783, 1789, 1830; S. Davidson, *Lectures on Biblical Criticism*, Edinburgh, 1839; *DNB*, xxxi. 10–12.

KENNION, GEORGE WYNDHAM: Church of England, bishop of Bath and Wells; b. at Harrogate (27 m. w. of York), Yorkshire, Sept. 5, 1845. He studied at Oriel College, Oxford (B.A., 1867), and was ordered deacon in 1869 and ordained priest in 1870. After being domestic chaplain to the bishop of Tuam in 1869–70, he was diocesan inspector of Yorkshire 1871–73 and vicar of St. Paul's, Sculcoates, Yorkshire, 1873–76 and of All Saints', Bradford, 1876–82. In 1882 he was consecrated bishop of Adelaide, and in 1894 was translated to the see of Bath and Wells. He was also visitor of Wadham College, Oxford, in 1882, lecturer in pastoral theology in the University of Cambridge in 1900, and Ramsden Preacher in the same university in the following year.

KENOSIS.

Scriptural Basis of Kenosis (§ 1).
Modern Rise of the Doctrine (§ 2).
Early Orthodox Exegesis not Kenotic (§ 3).
Concreteness of Early Christology (§ 4).
Foreshadowings of Kenoticism (§ 5).
The Antiochian School and Tertullian (§ 6).
Kenotic Undercurrent (§ 7).
The Problem Ignored by Scholasticism (§ 8).
Calvinism not Really Kenotic (§ 9).
Luther's Christology (§ 10).
Early Post-Lutheran Doctrine (§ 11).
Summary (§ 12).
English and American Treatment (§ 13).

1. Scriptural Basis of Kenosis.

Ever since the middle of the nineteenth century, it has been usual among Protestant, and especially Lutheran, theologians to find the basis for a special doctrine of what is called the *kenōsis* or self-emptying of Christ in the passage (Phil. ii. 6–8) where Paul says that Christ "being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation (Gk. *heauton ekenōsen*) and took upon him the form of a servant." Although this doctrine is now of little influence among dogmatic theologians, the popularity which it enjoyed and its relation to the older dogmatic development makes a detailed treatment of it useful for the knowledge of the present condition of the Christological problem (see Christology, IX., X.).

2. Modern Rise of the Doctrine.

The regular Lutheran orthodoxy had seen in the phrase quoted an aphorism relating to the historic Christ, partly because the subject of the verb, "Christ Jesus," is a term usually so applied, and partly because "a kenosis properly so called can not be predicated of the Logos apart from the flesh, of the abstract Deity, who is immutable and invariable" (J. Gerhard, *Loci*, IV., xiv. 294). The application of the expression to the preexistent Christ was made first, among modern Lutheran theologians, by Ernst Sartorius, tentatively in 1832 and then more fully in his *Lehre von der heiligen Liebe* (ii. 21 sqq., Hamburg, 1844). In the same year Johann Ludwig König expressed similar ideas in Hegelian phraseology; and in 1845 began to appear Thomasius' *Beiträge zur kirchlichen Christologie*, which inaugurated the triumph of the modern conception of the kenosis. Here, apparently, the perfect oneness of the person of Christ was assured, since it was the divine Logos himself who laid aside the fulness of his divine Nature in all the relations in which it manifests itself externally, bringing himself down to the level of a human individual; the possibility of a real human development of Jesus was assured, since the Logos determined to subject his divine being to the forms of human existence, under the laws of human development, retaining the use of his absolute power only so far as it was required for his redeeming work; the Calvinistic theory of the union of Godhead and manhood so that the whole of the former still existed outside the latter was avoided; and the doctrine of the Communicatio Idiomatum (q.v.) was preserved. Substantial assent was given to the teaching of Thomasius by Lutherans like Kahnis, Luthardt and Delitzsch, by United theologians like Gaupp and J. P. Lange, and by some Reformed writers, especially Ebrard and later Godet in his commentary on John. Thomasius took heed of criticism so far as to attempt, in his most important work, *Christi Person und Werk* (part ii., Erlangen, 1855), to avoid the alleged Apollinarianism of his *Beiträge* by a distinction between the essential attributes of God (absolute power, truth, holiness, love) and the merely relative attributes affected by the kenosis (omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence), thus meeting the charge that he had taught a mutability of the divine nature. He maintained, however, that his doctrine of the kenosis was the necessary outcome of the whole previous dogmatic development. He did not deny that the view of the early Church had in general been a different one, but he was convinced that Lutheran Christology, in which the Incarnation was more deeply realized, required his conclusion.

3. Early Orthodox Exegesis not Kenotic.

The passage in Philippians was used as early as Marcion; but the important phrase for him was "the *likeness of* man": for his Docetic position the *ekenōsen* phrase could be nothing more than a general indication of the apparition of the Logos in the lower world. The work *ekenōsen* is quoted first by the Gnostic Theodotus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, to all of whom it seems to be nothing more than an expression designating the Incarnation. As long as the estimate of the person of Christ took its departure from the historic Christ (which, apart from Gnosticism, was the case down to the apologists), no reflection was likely to be made upon the kenosis of the preexistent Logos. It is only after the beginning of Catholic theology with Clement, Irenaeus, and Tertullian that the text in Philippians belongs to the passages regularly used to describe the Incarnation; Origen, in fact, understands the official doctrine to assert that the Son of God "emptying himself (*se ipsum exinaniens*) and becoming man was incarnate." With scarcely an exception the early writers saw the subject of *ekenōsen* in the *logos asarkos*, the Word apart from the flesh. Only Novatian, Ambrosiaster, Pelagius, and the commentary based on him which goes under the name of Primasius of Hadrumetum understand the subject to be the Word made flesh. An exegetical predisposition was therefore extant in the early Church for a theory similar to the modern kenosis-theory. But that is the most that can be said. For the usual exposition of the text sees in the "self-emptying" of the Logos merely an equivalent for the "taking the form of a servant," and that again is merely an equivalent for "becoming incarnate." Origen asserts that the rule of faith lays down that the Logos "being made man remained that which he was before"; and Augustine, echoing the voice of the older tradition, says: "Thus he emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, not losing the form of God; the form of a servant was added, the form of God not subtracted." Athanasius and Gregory of Nyssa, while admitting that the Word so far emptied himself as to appear not in his native majesty but in the humility of human nature, yet insist on his unaltered substantial greatness; and this remained the established view. Athanasius, in opposition to the Arians, who made the Son of God mutable in nature and immediately subject to human development, necessities, troubles, and sufferings, fights for the unchangeableness of the Logos as the palladium of orthodoxy; the Logos does not increase in wisdom (Luke ii. 52), is not hungry or troubled even unto death (John xii. 27), is not in ignorance of the day of judgment, does not suffer or die—all these things happen only to his “ flesh,” to his human nature. And after Athanasius not only the Antiochian school but even Apollinaris and Cyril make similarly strong assertions of the unchangeableness of the Godhead of the Logos, such things as ignorance, sleeping, being troubled, and still more suffering and death being referred only in a derived or loose sense to the Logos proper. By a corresponding train of thought, the “ exaltation ” of Phil. ii. 9 is always in patristic theology referred exclusively to the human nature of Christ. In all this there is no room for such a theory as that of Thomasius; in fact, it is more than once expressly opposed. Hilary mentions something not dissimilar as one of the views on the Incarnation to be avoided, and Cyril of Alexandria controverts two different kenotic theories, the exact meaning of the more important of which is disputable and obscure—but Cyril's attitude is unmistakable; he rejects both with equal firmness, and insists again on the way in which the Godhead fills all in all; a limitation of the Godhead in Christ is essentially unthinkable on account of his unity with the Father. But the very energy with which the Fathers reject any mutability of the Godhead, as much in relation to the Incarnation as anywhere else, would, taken by itself, make the whole conception of the Incarnation practically unsustainable. Its immense importance to early Christian thought would be unintelligible if this were all we knew about primitive Christological development.

4. Concreteness of Early Christology.

But this is not all. It must be borne in mind that the idea of the Incarnation is older than any realization of the difficulties which beset it. It springs not only from the passage in Philippians, but also from such thoughts as those of II Cor. iv. 4; John i. 14; I John i. 1. It appears definitely in Ignatius, in a form as far as possible removed from Docetic imaginings. With almost paradoxical sharpness he contrasts the Godhead and the passible manhood of Christ, in a way that by no means suggests what would now be called kenosis; he is rather filled with the conception that the invisible, incomprehensible, impassible God became visible, tangible, passible in the historical person of Jesus. How the revelation of the invisible God in the historic Christ came to pass, he does not undertake to say; he merely asserts the fact with firm conviction, dealing with a condescension of the revelation of God to our level, in a “ simple modalistic ” manner. Ideas of this kind did not die out with Ignatius, but through the theology of Asia Minor leavened the later development. Irenaeus, although he does not quote the *ekenōsen*, obviously connects them with the thought of the passage. With him, however, it is clear that the basis is not a metaphysical kenosis-theory of the self-transformation of the Logos, but the “ simple modalistic ” conviction that “ the man without beauty and subject to suffering,” the historic Christ, was, “ in a different way from all men who then lived, God and Lord and King eternal, the only-begotten, the incarnate Word proclaimed by all the prophets and apostles ” (*Haer.* IV., xx. 2). The faith in “ God manifest in the flesh,” centering around the indivisible historic personality of Jesus, is what carries the belief in the Incarnation through all the difficulties which arose as soon as men began to attempt to define the manner of the Incarnation. It is this unquestioning belief in “ God in man ” (Ignatius, *Ephesians*, vii. 2), not any formal theory of a kenosis or anything else, which forms the real basis of the primitive doctrine on the subject.

5. Foreshadowings of Kenoticism.

Nor, when theories begin to appear, are they kenotic, at least not in the sense of Thomasius. The oldest occurs in Irenaeus—the same Irenaeus who speaks of “ the impassible becoming passible ” and of “ the very Word of God incarnate suspended on the tree,” and who vehemently opposes the Gnostic distinction between “ Jesus who suffered ” and “ Christ who departed before the Passion.” In so far, however, as he had a theory, he distinguished in the historic Christ the Logos and the *homo ejus*, and, quite in accord with the later development, regarded the man as the object of temptation, suffering, death, in which the Logos had no part, being, on the other hand, “ with ” “ the man ” in victory, resurrection, and ascension. Here is the source of the appearance of kenotic ideas, in this doctrine of the Logos taking into himself a part of his creation. He who “ according to his invisible nature contains all things ” came “ to us not as he was able to come, but as we were able to receive him.” Here is indeed a self-limitation of the Logos; but it is a progressively less and less self-limited communication of himself on the part of a Logos remaining all the while in undiminished majesty, to man who progressively responds more and more to the approach; it is the sort of self-limitation asserted, not of the Logos but of the “ One God,” by dynamic Monarchianism. This conception of the dynamic indwelling of the Logos in the man Jesus is not peculiar to Irenaeus, but is to be perceived down to the final disappearance of the Antiochian tradition in the reign of Justinian. Origen is the special representative of this view. In his controversy with Celsus, who had objected that if God came down in person to men he must have left his throne and suffered change, Origen replies that Celsus knows not the power of God nor that “ the Spirit of the Lord filleth the earth ” (Wisd. i. 7); that even if the God of all, according to his power, came down to take part with Jesus in earthly life, if the Logos who in the beginning was with God and was God came to us, it did not mean that he lost or left his throne, or that he quitted one place to fill another which before had not contained him. That in some of Origen's expressions there is room for an earthly and human development of Jesus is clear enough; but these views have nothing in common with a kenosis theory like that of Thomasius.

6. The Antiochian School and Tertullian.

Through Paul of Samosata and Lucian, with some direct influence from Irenaeus, these views came down to the Antiochian school; and it is neither unfair nor surprising that Cyril and Apollinaris object to their theology that it goes only as far as uniting man with God, not as far as God in man (*enanthropesis*). But this weakness of the early teaching on the Incarnation shows itself not only in Origen and the Antiochian school. Similar thoughts are met with in Athanasius, though already with the complementary ideas which alone remain in Cyril; and from the Council of Nicæa a direct road leads through Marcellus to the dynamic Monarchianism of Photinus. In the West also, which followed Antiochian lines down to 553, in spite of the insistence on the single personality, there are clear enough traces of the idea of a dynamic indwelling of the Logos in the man Jesus. It is evidently not worth while to seek echoes of kenotic ideas in Tertullian; if it could be done at all, it could only be after all danger was past of getting lost in the maze created by a mixture of "simple-modalistic" thoughts, of apologetic conceptions of a theophany, and of traditions of a dynamic indwelling of the *verbum* (=*sapientia*=*spiritus*) in Christ. The matter is still more complicated in the case of Hilary, even after the painstaking labors of Baur, Dorner, Thomasius, and Wirthmüller. But a minute examination of the works of that eloquent and deep-thinking theologian should convince the unprejudiced student that his doctrine is as little kenotic, in the sense of Thomasius, as that of Irenaeus, on whom he shows a certain dependence.

7. Kenotic Undercurrent.

That in theoretical expositions of the Incarnation which held strongly to the immutability of the Godhead expressions should now and then be used which give color to kenotic ideas is not to be wondered at; and the phenomenon occurs not only in Hilary, not only in Irenaeus and Origen, but also in the two Gregories, of Nazianzus and of Nyssa. This was natural enough, both because the doctrine of the Incarnation rested on the thought of "God manifest in the flesh," and because simple souls understood "the Word was made flesh" for themselves, regardless of the restrictions of theologians; and when "simple-docetic" views were ruled out, there was scarcely anything left for them but the kenotic. The spread of Arianism may possibly be explained by the fact that without hair-splitting it recognizes its Logos as the passible subject of the historic person Jesus. The kenotic undercurrent is partly responsible for the title "Mother of God" and for the phrase (very old in a simple-modalistic sense) "God crucified." In proportion as the Antiochian school, which disapproved of these expressions, was suppressed, the undercurrent came to the surface; and Apollinaris, the antithesis of the Antiochian theologians, sought to give a theological dress to the ideas which it bore with it. After the condemnation of Apollinarianism, such kenosis theories as he had framed were of course impossible—though it is strange that the Alexandrian theology won its victory over Nestorianism and its final triumph at the Council of Chalcedon without showing traces of them. For if (as was *de fide* after 553) the *hypostasis tou logou* took to itself an impersonal human nature, a real human life of the historic Jesus is unthinkable if the real subject of this historic person, the Logos, retained his omniscience and his impassibility. But so far as it was possible without endangering the conceptual integrity of the two natures, theologians combated the undercurrent; and they were content to guard the formulas which set the "mystery of the Incarnation" beyond understanding.

8. The Problem Ignored by Scholasticism.

In the medieval West, the scholastic theology spent much formal labor on the doctrine of the Incarnation, without paying any attention to the passage in Philippians. That "the Word of God was not changed" in the Incarnation was an accepted axiom; but whether the finally prevalent formula, that not the nature common to the divine Persons, but the person of the Word, became incarnate, was ever brought into connection with the Philippian passage, it is impossible to say. In any case, its distinction between the nature and the person of the Word would have no significance for the question under discussion; and in regard to the kenosis the medieval Church did not get beyond the early consensus indicated above. The present Roman Catholic theology is in the same position, and pays no heed to the question of kenosis.

9. Calvinism not Really Kenotic.

Nor did Calvinistic theology go beyond the early consensus, although the use made of the text in Philippians has given the impression that there was a special Calvinistic doctrine on the subject. Calvin says (*Institutes* II., xiii. 2): "Paul shows in Phil. ii. 7, that Christ, since he was God, might have at once manifested his glory openly to the world, but waived his right and of his own will emptied himself, putting on the form of a servant and, content with that humble station, suffering his Divinity to be hidden by a veil of flesh." This kenosis is sometimes described in language which seems to imply a real alteration of the condition of the Logos; but too much weight must not be laid on these expressions, the limitations of which may easily be shown by other more authoritative words, especially the so-called *Extra Calvinisticum:* "Since the Godhead can not be comprehended and is everywhere present, it follows of necessity that it exists outside of (*extra*) the human nature which it assumed, but none the less abides within it and personally united with it" (*Catechism*, ques. 48); "the Logos united human nature with himself in such a manner that he totally inhabited it, and yet totally remained outside of (*extra*) it, since he is immeasurable and infinite" (Maresius in Schneckenburger, p. 9). There is really here no self-emptying; the Calvinist theologians said with Augustine that the Logos "hid what he was," and the veil was humanity which was capable of containing the Godhead only in a limited measure.

10. Luther's Christology.

The question now arises whether the Lutheran theology supplied the defects of the earlier teaching on the Incarnation. Luther's own teaching has so many sides that great care is needed to avoid misrepresenting him. Certain points may be brought out safely, however. (1) Luther adhered with equal firmness, during his whole public career, to the true divinity and the true humanity of the one historic person of Christ. (2) He was never inclined to bring the two into relation by anything like the theory of Thomasius, and as early as 1518 gave an exegesis of Phil. ii. 7, which would cut all Scriptural ground from under such a theory. (3) Phrases reminding us of Dorner's view are indeed present in Luther's earlier work; but it is impossible to explain his Christology by insistence on these. (4) He rather shaped his Christology from the first, and especially after the Lord's Supper controversy, along the lines of a doctrine of the two natures understood in an anti-Nestorian sense; and it is indisputable that his view of the suffering of the Son of God and of the communication of the divine attributes (including omnipresence) to Christ according to his humanity was a scholastic development of the *communicatio idiomatum* as taught in the early Church (see UBIQUITY). (5) But in spite of all Luther's polemics against the *alloisis* of Zwingli, it may fairly be asked whether he always regarded the communication of the divine attributes as real and actual. A number of logical difficulties in the way of this might be collected from his works, and sober thought must be convinced that the root of his doctrine was not in the teaching as to the two natures into which his historical position forced it to grow. (6) It is rather the ultimate datum of his Christology, that the historic person of Jesus was and is the God of revelation. The essential feature of his Christology is really this understanding of the revealing condescension of God, this harking back to "simple-modalistic" ideas. In connection with the notion of the dynamic indwelling of God in the man Jesus, this understanding of the historic personality of Jesus might have led to a new construction of Christology—if theologians had not been bound to the old tradition which constructed from above downward and to the scheme of the natures.

11. Early Post-Lutheran Doctrine.

But since they were, the Lutheran development could lead to nothing but a scholastic working out of the idea of the *communicatio idiomatum* as extended by Luther beyond the traditional content of the term. Schools differed in the manner of this working out; but they agreed in denying any real kenosis of the Logos. Chemnitz and Brenz are at one not only in saying that in the Incarnation the Word retained the fulness of his Godhead, but that this fulness was imparted to the humanity of Christ at the Incarnation. The only place where real kenotic ideas are found in the Lutheran theology of this period is among the Philippists; but even here they occur in nothing like the modern sense. When they speak of the Son of God "hiding" his majesty in our flesh and blood, or of an "exaltation according to both natures," they are merely Crypto-Calvinists. It is against them that the condemnation of the Formula of Concord is pronounced: "We reject the opinion that to Christ according to his divine nature all power in heaven and in earth was restored at his resurrection and ascension, as though he had laid aside and stripped himself of that power, even according to his divinity, while he was in the state of humiliation." The condemnation goes further than was necessary at the time, for neither Philippists nor Calvinists taught a "transmutation of the divine nature"; the important point is that it goes far enough to reach the modern kenotics.

For the Giessen-Tübingen controversy see CHRISTOLOGY, IX.

12. Summary.

The official or ecclesiastical theology of all ages, then, has rejected the idea of kenosis as now held. Just as in the early Church it appeared only in inferior undercurrents and with the "heretical" Apollinarists, so it was in the period from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century. Echoes of kenotic thought appear especially in Schwenckfeld, and an indubitable kenosis theory in Menno Simons; but in anything like official Protestant theology they occur first in the reckless speculation of Zinzendorf—although here there is no consistently worked out theory, and the kenotic ideas are crossed by regard paid to the official doctrine, including the *communicatio idiomatum*. But if not the mental ancestors, at least the forerunners of the modern kenotics are (with the nameless persons condemned by Hilary and Cyril and with the Apollinarists) Menno Simons and Zinzendorf. The kenosis theory is an attempt, made at the cost of breaking with certain undeniably ecclesiastical traditions, to save what has been characteristic of the official Christology of 1,700 years—a doctrine of the Incarnation constructed from above downward. Were it tenable in itself, modern theology would have no ground to reproach it with not being traditional. But its weaknesses, nay, its impossibilities, have been frequently indicated, and there is not space here to go into them again. It might be pointed out that the theory proceeds from views of the Trinity which are not far from an intolerable tritheism. If the Logos can become man in such a manner that "outside of the human form assumed by him, he has not reserved to himself a special existence, a special consciousness, a special sphere of operation or possession of power" (Thomasius, ii. 201), little is left of the principle of the Athanasian Creed, "not three Gods, but One God." The justification of the theory, so far as it has one, lies in the recognition, on the negative side, of the insufficiency of the old Christology, and on the positive in the necessity of leaving room for a real, true human life of Jesus. But all theories men can make of the Incarnation of God are temerarious at best; and the most temerarious of all, because it assumes to describe the inmost secrets of the Word as he becomes man, is the modern doctrine of kenosis.

(F. LOOFS.)

13. English and American Treatment.

English and American theories of kenosis are scarcely more than reproductions of German speculation on the same subject, influenced by the same motives and exhibiting the same general types (see CHRISTOLOGY). The conditions which determined this movement in Christology were—the pantheistic philosophy of Hegel and Schleiermacher which broke down the division wall between God and man and introduced a universal principle of identity; a humanitarian spirit which directed attention to the nature, the ideals, and the possibilities of man; a new interest in the historical Christ, fostered and made fruitful by a more adequate study of Christ and his times, especially by means of the synoptic Gospels; and a better method of psychology by which the human consciousness is interpreted and a truer estimate of personality reached. The three types of kenosis represented by English and American writers are: (1) During the whole period of the Incarnation, although the essential deity existed necessarily at all times and in all places, yet his conscious and efficient deity was wholly quiescent; he became very man. Only at the resurrection did he reassume the full power of deity—a condition insoluble to the reason (H. Crosby, *The True Humanity of Christ*, New York, 1880). (2) The Son of God voluntarily surrendered or abandoned certain natural prerogatives or external attributes of God, while he yet retained the essential, ethical properties of truth, holiness, and love (C. Gore, *The Incarnation*, New York, 1891, p. 172; A. M. Fairbairn, *The Place of Christ in Modern Thought*, New York, 1893, p. 476). (3) On the basis of an original kinship of God and man, in the incarnation by self-limitation God has become man (W. N. Clarke, *An Outline of Christian Theology*, New York, 1898, pp. 291–293; H. Van Dyke, *The Gospel for an Age of Doubt: The Human Life of God*, New York, 1897, pp. 123–167). Two explanations of this alleged inner change of the Logos in the Incarnation are given. One is the capacity of consciousness to retire a portion of its riches into the region of the subconscious so that for the time they become as if they were not (R. H. Hutton, *Essays Theological and Literary*, London, 1871, pp. 259–260). The other suggestion is derived from the assumption of a self-limitation of God in the creative action and with reference to future choices and deeds of moral beings; and the Incarnation is a further exhibition of the principle by which God governs himself in relation to the world (D. W. Simon, *Reconciliation through Incarnation*, Edinburgh, 1898). There is at present a strong tendency to seek a solution of the problems raised by the personal life of Christ by the ethical, rather than by the metaphysical, path. C. A. B.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The history of the subject is necessarily dealt with in the treatises on the history of doctrine and on dogmatics, especially in the sections on Christology. Consult further: F. C. Baur, *Die christliche Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit und Menschwerdung Gottes*, 3 vols., Tübingen, 1841–43; M. Schneckenburger, *Zur kirchlichen Theologie. Die orthodoxe Lehre vom doppelten Stande*, Pforzheim, 1848; I. A. Dorner, *Entwickelungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1845–53, Eng. transl., *Hist. of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, 5 vols., Edinburgh, 1861–63; idem, in *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, i (1856), 361–416; A. Tholuck, *Disputatio christologica de . . . Phil. ii. 6–9*, Halle, 1848; G. Thomasius, *Christi Person und Werk*, vol. ii., Erlangen, 1857; H. Schultz, *Die Lehre von der Gottheit Christi*, Gotha, 1881; F. J. Hall, *The Kenotic Theory Considered, with Particular Reference to its Anglican Forms*, London, 1898; O. Bensow, *Die Lehre von der Kenose*, Leipsic, 1903; R. C. Morgan, *God's Self-emptied Servant*, ib. 1906; Harnack, *Dogma*, iv. 140, 161–162, vii. 244; *DCG*, i. 927–928; and the commentaries on Philippians.

KENRICK, FRANCIS PATRICK: Archbishop of Baltimore; b. at Dublin, Ireland, Dec. 3, 1797; d. at Baltimore July 8, 1863. He received his theological training in the College of the Propaganda, Rome, and came to America in 1821. He was the head of the Roman Catholic seminary at Bardstown, Ky., 1821–30, coadjutor bishop of Philadelphia 1830–42, bishop of Philadelphia 1842–51, and archbishop of Baltimore 1851–63. As apostolic delegate he presided over the first plenary council of the United States, convened at Baltimore May, 1852 (see BALTIMORE COUNCILS); and in 1859 the pope conferred upon him and his successors the "primacy of honor" over other American archbishops. Besides polemical works, he wrote *Theologia dogmatica* (4 vols., Philadelphia, 1839–40; 2d ed., 3 vols., Mechlin, 1858), and *Theologia moralis* (3 vols., 1841–43; 2d ed., Mechlin, 1859). These volumes constitute a complete body of divinity, and are considered classical in the Roman Catholic seminaries of America. He also published an annotated and revised translation of the entire New Testament (2 vols., New York, 1849–1851), and of the Psalms, Book of Wisdom, and Canticles (Baltimore, 1857), Job and the Prophets (1859), the Pentateuch (1860), and historical books of the Old Testament (1862).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. J. O'Shea, *The Two Kenricks*, Philadelphia, 1904.

KENRICK, PETER RICHARD: Archbishop of St. Louis, brother of Francis Patrick Kenrick (q.v.); b. at Dublin, Ireland, Aug. 17, 1806; d. at St. Louis Mar. 4, 1896. He studied theology at Maynooth, came to Philadelphia in 1833, took charge of *The Catholic Herald*, and became pastor of the cathedral parish of Philadelphia in 1835. After having been for a time president of the diocesan seminary he became vicar-general about 1837. He was coadjutor bishop of St. Louis 1841–43, bishop 1843–47, and archbishop 1847–96. In the Vatican Council he opposed the dogma of papal infallibility, but accepted it when it was promulgated. Besides a number of translations, he published *The Holy House of Loretto* (Philadelphia, n.d.), and *The Validity of Anglican Ordinations Examined* (1841).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. J. O'Shea, *The Two Kenricks*, Philadelphia, 1904.

KENT, CHARLES FOSTER: Congregationalist; b. at Palmyra, N. Y., Aug. 13, 1867. He was educated at Yale (B.A., 1889; Ph.D., 1891), Yale Divinity School (B.D., 1891), and the University of Berlin (1891–92). After being instructor in the University of Chicago(1893–95) and professor of Biblical literature and history in Brown University (1895–1901), he became, in 1901, Woolsey professor of Biblical literature in Yale University. Besides his work as editor of *The Historical Series for Bible Students* (in collaboration with F. K. Sanders; New York, 1899 sqq.), he has published: *The Messages of the Bible* (1899 sqq.); *Library of Ancient Inscriptions* (in collaboration with F. K. Sanders; 1904 sqq.), and *The Student's Old Testament* (1904 sqq.), he has written *Outlines of Hebrew History* (Providence, R. I., 1895); *The Wise Men of Ancient Israel and their Proverbs* (New York, 1895); *A History of the Hebrew People: The United Kingdom* (1896); *A History of the Hebrew People: The Divided Kingdom* (1897); *A History of the Jewish People: The Babylonian, Persian, and Greek Periods* (1899); *The Messages of the Earlier Prophets* (1899); *The Messages of the Later Prophets* (1900); *The Messages of Israel's Lawgivers* (1902); *Narratives of the Beginnings of Hebrew History* (1904); *Israel's Historical and Biographical Narratives* (1905); *Origin and Permanent Value of the Old Testament* (1906); *Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents* (1907); *Founders and Rulers of United Israel from . . . Moses to the Division of the Hebrew Kingdom* (1908); *Heroes and Crises of Early Hebrew History* (1908); and *Kings and Prophets of Israel and Judah* (1909).

KENTIGERN, ken′ti-gern, **SAINT:** known also as **St. Mungo:** The apostle of the Strathclyde Britons and patron of the city of Glasgow; according to his twelfth-century lives, b. at Culross, probably in 518; d. in Glasgow Jan. 13, 603. His birth is surrounded with a halo of mystery, and his mother may have been a nun. He was trained in a monastic school at Culross, and in early manhood settled at Cathures (Glasgow) and became bishop of those who had remained Christian from the time of Ninian. Because of attacks from the heathen he went to Wales and founded there the monastery of Llanelwy (St. Asaph). In 573 the Christians gained the supremacy in the north and Kentigern returned. He reclaimed the Picts of Galloway and the Strathclyde Britons who had lapsed into paganism, visited the land northeast of the Forth, and is even said to have sent missionaries to the islands, to Norway, and to Iceland. His life was written by Jocelin of Furness, c. 1180.

Bibliography: *Lives of St. Ninian and St. Kentigern*, ed. A. P. Forbes, Edinburgh, 1874; idem, *Kalendars of Scottish Saints*, pp. 362–373, Edinburgh, 1872; T. MacLauchlan, *The Early Scotch Church*, chap. x., Edinburgh, 1865; *DNB*, xxxi. 26–27; *DCB*, 603–605 (excellent for sources).

KEPHART, kep′hārt, **ISAIAH LAFAYETTE:** United Brethren; b. in Decatur Township, Pa., Dec. 10, 1832. He studied at Otterbein University, Westerville, O. (1857–61), was licensed to preach in 1859, joined the Allegheny Conference of his denomination, and was at East Salem, Pa., 1861–63. He was chaplain of the Twenty-First Pennsylvania Cavalry throughout the war, and preached at Hummelstown, Pa., 1865–67. He became principal of the public schools of Jefferson, Ia., 1867; superintendent of schools in Greene County, Ia., 1869; professor of natural science in Western College, Ia., 1871, actuary of the United Brethren Aid Society of Pennsylvania, residing at Lebanon, Pa., 1876; professor of mental and moral science in San Joaquin Valley College, Cal., 1883; president of Westfield College, Westfield, Ill., 1885; editor of *The Religious Telescope*, the official organ of his denomination, 1889. He has written: *Biography of Rev. Jacob S. Kessler* (Dayton, O., 1867); *Evils of the Use of Tobacco by Christians* (1882); *The Holy Spirit in the Devout Life* (1904); and *Life of Ezekiel Boring Kephart* (1908).

KERI AND KETHIBH: Words (in the form of Aramaic participles) employed by the Masoretes (see Masorah) to distinguish the pointed or voweled from the unpointed text of the Old Testament. *Kethîbh*, " written " or " what is written," designates the original form of the text of the Old Testament in which the words were represented by their consonants alone; *keri*, " read " or " what is to be read," refers to the completely vocalized text. Of the kethibh it is necessary to say only that it was intended to represent the form in which all the Hebrew Scriptures were written (without vowels) by their authors, and that after it was adopted as the authorized text, no alteration in the words or letters was ever permitted. The keri serves two main purposes. It makes the exact reading or pronunciation of the words perfectly clear by inserting their vowels; and it is used to correct the possible errors which, perhaps from the very beginning, were observed in the kethibh or traditional text. Since the second purpose could not be attained by introducing notes into the body of the text, the divergences of the keri from the kethibh were pointed out in the margin by characteristic methods and devices which may be observed in any current copy of the Hebrew Bible. As a help to the understanding of them, several modern editions contain a useful Masoretic clavis.

Some common and natural misconceptions may be alluded to. The keri, when cited in the margin, is not always intended as a substitute for the kethibh or official reading. It often merely records a traditional variant reading. Nor, on the other hand, was the kethibh made an unchangeable text because it was thought to be infallible. The official text (authorized not long after the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 A.D.), was chosen not because it was perfect but because it was thought to be the most correct, and because a single archetype was (perhaps wisely) deemed necessary. This is proved by the fact that even the accidental peculiarities of the copy thus chosen were retained and still remain. Again, the Masoretes or Jewish editors did not establish or even seek to influence the keri or the traditional readings as marked by the vowel signs. The received form of words goes back to times several centuries before the Masoretes began their work. It was perpetuated chiefly by the synagogal services (see Synagogue); and, of course, without the pronunciation of the words the kethibh itself could not have been preserved.

J. F. McCurdy.

Bibliography: C. D. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*, London, 1897; F. G. Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient MSS.*, ib. 1896; T. H. Weir, *A Short Hist. of the Hebrew Text of the O. T.*, ib. 1899. Much of the literature in the bibliography under Bible Text, I., contains information on the subject.

KERN, JOHN ADAM: Methodist Episcopal, South; b. near Winchester, Va., Apr. 23, 1846. He studied at the University of Virginia 1868–70, having already entered the ministry of his denomination in 1864. For twenty-one years he was engaged in pastoral work in the Baltimore Conference. From 1886 to 1893 he was professor of moral philosophy in Randolph-Macon College, of which he became vice-president in 1893 and president in 1897. Since 1899 he has been professor of practical theology in Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. He has been elected four times to the General Conference of his denomination, and in theology is Evangelical, and favorable to all reverent and scholarly study of the Scriptures and development of Christian doctrine. He has written *The Ministry to the Congregation* (Nashville, Tenn., 1897); *The Way of the Preacher* (1902); *The Idea of the Church* (1906); and *The Listening Heart* (1908).

KERO: A monk said to have lived in the monastery of St. Gall during the rule of Abbot Othmar (720–759) and formerly supposed to have been the author of the Old High German interlinear version of the Benedictine rule and the "Keronian glosses." This tradition, however, originated with Jodocus Metzler (d. 1639), and owes its currency chiefly to Melchior Goldast (d. 1635). Other works were also attributed to Kero, probably on the basis of the name Kero or Kerolt written at the end of a St. Gall manuscript which was burned in 1768. There was actually a Kero at this monastery in the latter part of the eighth century, but he can not have been the author of the translation of the Benedictine rule prepared shortly after 802 at the command of Charlemagne, for this version, uncouth, corrupt, and grossly unintelligent, was the work of several hands. The Keronian glosses, moreover, are an extract from an Old High German interlinear translation of a Latin dictionary, the version apparently originating at Freising about 740.

(E. Steinmeyer.)

Bibliography: On Kero consult: B. Pez, *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*, i. 3, p. 586, Augsburg, 1721; W. Scherer, in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, xviii. 145–149; *KL*, vii. 393. On the Benedictine rule, P. Piper, *Nachträge zur ältern deutschen Litteratur*, pp. 22–162, Stuttgart, 1898; on the glosses, R. Kögel, *Ueber das Keronische Glossar*, Halle, 1879.

KESSLER, JOHANN (JOHANNES CHESSELIUS, or AHENARIUS): Reformer and chronicler of St. Gall; b. at St. Gall, Switzerland, 1502 (1503?); d. there Feb. 24, 1574. He studied theology at Basel, and in 1522, attracted by Luther's fame, went to Wittenberg, where he was fully won for the Reformation. On his return to St. Gall in 1523 he abandoned the idea of taking orders, and became a saddler. Nevertheless, in 1524 he began to preach and hold meetings in private houses, and the impression he made was so strong that the magistrates became alarmed and interfered. In 1525 he resumed his ministerial work, and in 1536 he became, with the consent of the council, the regular preacher to the Evangelical congregation of St. Margaret. Vadian introduced him into the circle of his friends, and the council elected him to various positions. In 1537 he became teacher of ancient languages at the gymnasium, and in 1542 regular pastor of St. Gall. On the death of Vadian in 1551 it became the task of Kessler to continue the Reformation. He was a careful observer and made use of his leisure hours to write a chronicle on the persons and events of his time, which he entitled *Sabbata* (ed. Ernst Götzinger, in *Mitteilungen zur vaterländischen Geschichte*, v.–x., St. Gall, 1866–68). It is one of the best and most fruitful sources for the history of the Swiss Reformation from 1519 to 1539, and for the history of the inner life of the time.

(Emil Egli†.)

Bibliography: Sources are his own letters, preserved at St. Gall and his writings. A new ed. of the *Sabbata*, with notes and biography, was published by E. Egli and R. Schoch, St. Gall, 1902. Consult also: J. J. Bernet, *Johann Kessler*, ib. 1826; Schaff, *Christian Church*, vi. 385, vii. 127; S. M. Jackson, *Huldreich Zwingli*, New York, 1903.

KESWICK CONVENTION: A summer religious reunion, lasting one week, which has been held annually at Keswick (24 m. s.s.w. of Carlisle), England, since 1875, chiefly "for the promotion of practical holiness" by means of prayer, discussion, and personal intercourse. It may be said to have had its origin in the general revival that swept over England in the early seventies (Moody and Sankey, and others). The first meeting was held at Broadlands, near Romsey, July 17–23, 1874, followed by a convention at Oxford Aug. 29 to Sept. 7, 1874, and one at Brighton May 29 to June 7, 1875. At the Brighton convention Canon Harford-Battersby, vicar of St. John's, Keswick, suggested a convention at Keswick, to be held the following July on the grounds of his own vicarage. Since then the convention has met annually at Keswick, the last week in July, and year by year it has grown in numbers and influence. The meetings are held in a large tent and are attended by several thousand people, including representatives from foreign countries. The services are notable for their spiritual character, for the prominence given to silent prayer, and for their apostolic simplicity, music and all else being subordinated to the one object —the glory of God through the promotion of truth and holiness. Since the Holy Spirit is recognized as the leader of all meetings, there has never been any formal election of a chairman. During his lifetime Canon Harford-Battersby presided over the convention. After his death the chairmanship passed by general consent to Mr. Henry Bowker, and, after him, to Mr. Robert Wilson. The Keswick movement is distinctly Evangelical in character, and is supported chiefly by the Evangelical branch of the Church of England. Keswick stands for no new school of theological thought. The Keswick speakers and teachers, some fifty in number, are conservative in spirit, clinging to old truths and avoiding new and strange doctrines. Without exception they hold to the absolute plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures in every part. To them the Bible is the final court of appeal in matters both of faith and duty. In the Keswick teaching stress is laid upon the infilling of the Spirit, and upon the power of faith to claim promised blessings. The convention takes an active interest in missions and maintains a number of missionaries in foreign fields. The literature of the convention includes the *Life of Faith* (London, 1879 sqq.), the weekly organ of Keswick teaching, *The Keswick Week* (an annual volume containing addresses delivered at the convention), and the *Keswick Library* (London, 1894 sqq.), a series of religious booklets.

Bibliography: *The Keswick Convention; its Message, its Method, and its Men*, ed. C. F. Harford, London, 1907; A. T. Pierson, *The Keswick Movement*, New York, 1907; E. H. Hopkins, *The Story of Keswick*, London, 1892; and T. D. Harford-Battersby, *Memoirs of the Keswick Convention*, ib., 1890.

KETHE, WILLIAM. See Sternhold, Thomas.

KETHUBHIM. See Canon of Scripture, I., 4, § 2.

KETTELER, ket′te-ler, **WILHELM EMANUEL, BARON VON:** Bishop of Mainz; b. at Münster Dec. 25, 1811; d. at Burghausen (58 m. e. of Munich), Upper Bavaria, July 13, 1877. He was educated by the Jesuits at Brieg, Switzerland. He studied law at Göttingen, Berlin, Munich, and Heidelberg, and was *Referendar* at Münster 1834–1838. After studying theology at Munich and Münster he received ordination in 1844, became pastor at Hopsten, Westphalia, in 1846, and provost of the Hedwigskirche, Berlin, in 1849. He was appointed bishop of Mainz in 1850. To restore the Church of Rome to its old power and splendor was the great idea of his life; and, as the acknowledged leader of the Ultramontane party in Germany, he fought for this idea with as much adroitness as audacity. At the Council of the Vatican he belonged to the minority, but, as soon as the dogma of papal infallibility was promulgated, he accepted it and published it in his diocese. Well aware of the danger to the realization of his ideas which arose from the establishment of a German empire under the Protestant house of Hohenzollern, he resisted the consolidation of the new organization in every possible way. He opposed vigorously Bismarck's policy of placing the Roman Catholic Church, in its relation to the State, on an equality with other social institutions, and advocated a policy of resistance to state legislation involving ecclesiastical affairs. His numerous writings include, *Freiheit, Autorität, und Kirche* (Mainz, 1862); *Die wahren Grundlagen des religiösen Friedens* (1868); *Das allgemeine Konzil und seine Bedeutung für unsere Zeit* (1869); *Die Katholiken im deutschen Reich* (1873); *Der Kulturkampf* (1874); and *Predigten* (2 vols., 1878).

Bibliography: O. Pfülf, *Bischof von Ketteler*, 3 vols., Mainz, 1899; F. Greiffenrath, *Bischof . . . von Ketteler und die deutsche Socialreform*, Frankfort, 1893; J. Wenzel, *W. E. . . . von Ketteler, der Lehrer . . . der katholisch-socialen Bestrebungen*, Berlin, 1895; E. de Girard, *Ketteler et la question ouvrière*, Berne, 1896; *KL*, vi. 402–406.

KETTENBACH, ket′ten-bāH, **HEINRICH VON:** German Franciscan monk. The place and year of his birth and death, as well as his ancestry, are unknown, and there seems to be little foundation for the common belief that he was a member of a noble family, although from the style of his writings it might be presumed that he was of Franconian origin. In the latter part of 1521 he was in the Franciscan monastery at Ulm, where he displayed great zeal as a preacher and denounced the idleness and corruption of the clergy with fearless satire. In a controversy with the Dominican preacher Peter Nestler he denied that the Church was empowered to amend or supplement the sanctions of the Scriptures, declaring that it was based on an unalterable Gospel, ridiculing the doctrine of papal infallibility, and praising Luther, Melanchthon and Karlstadt as soldiers in the divine cause. In his sermon *Von der christlichen Kirche* (Ulm 1522?), delivered in the summer of 1522, he expounded the doctrine of a Church consisting of the community of the elect, living in common possession of service, chattels, joys and sorrows, and founded upon Christ and not upon Peter, whose church was rather the synagogue of Satan, the imposture of the western world, as Mohammed's is of the East. Luther is hailed as the prophet of the times, laboring in the spirit of Elijah and with the wisdom of Daniel. In spite of the Edict of Worms and the opposition of the bishop of Constance, Kettenbach remained at his post till late in 1522, supported by the good-will of a large part of the population. At the end of the year, however, he was obliged to make a precipitate retreat from the city. It is not definitely known where he went, although, from his active participation in Franz von Sickingen's expedition against Treves, it might be inferred that that region was his immediate place of refuge. The imprint of his later works would point to a residence in Saxony.

The character of Kettenbach's works reveals the growth of an opposition to the Roman Catholic Church which found vent in exhortations to the clergy and the cities to take up arms for the Reformed religion. The *Vergleichung des Allerheiligsten Herrn und Vaters, des Papsts, gegen den seltsam fremden Gast in der Christenheit, genannt Jesus* (Augsburg, 1523) is a succession of sharply drawn antitheses between the doctrines of the Gospel and those of the Church. In his *Practica, praktiziert aus der Bibel auf viel zukünftige Jahre* (1523), Kettenbach addressed himself to the inhabitants of the imperial towns, urging them to embrace the cause of the lower nobility against the princes, and defending Luther against the charge of having brought disorder into the country. The magistracy of Nuremberg prohibited and confiscated the *Practica* on Sept. 15, 1523, because of its attack on the pope and the emperor. After the death of Franz von Sickingen in May, 1523, Kettenbach published the *Vermahnung Franzens von Sickingen an sein Heer*, in which the attempt was made to vindicate him from the accusation of having brought civil war into Germany. There is no certain proof, however, that Kettenbach himself was the author. The last of his important writings was *Eine neue Apologia und Verantwortung Martini Luthers wider der Papisten Mordgeschrei* (Wittenberg, 1523), in which the Reformer is cleared of such charges as those of opposing the sacraments, minimizing the importance of confession, attacking the mass, and introducing disorder into the Church. After such intense literary activity during 1522 and 1523 it is surprising to find him silent during the following year. He is known to have preached a sermon on Matt. vii. 15 in the summer of 1525, but this is the last trace of his existence. It has been conjectured that he may have perished in the Peasants' Revolt or that he may have been identical with the Franciscan Heinrich Spelt who was still active in 1526. (G. Kawerau.)

Bibliography: G. Veesenmeyer, *Beyträge zur Geschichte der Litteratur und Reformation*, pp. 79–117, Ulm, 1792; *ADB*, xv. 676–678.

KETTLER, GOTTHARD: Last master of the Teutonic order in Livonia and first duke of Courland; b. in Westphalia 1511; d. at Mitau (25 m. s.w. of Riga), Courland, May 17, 1587. He was of prominent family and was educated for the ministry. When about twenty years old, he went to Livonia and entered the service of the Teutonic order, in which he won high respect by his prudence and energy. The Reformation had already found its way into Livonia, and Kettler did not oppose its progress; he was strengthened and confirmed in Evangelical convictions by repeated sojourns at Wittenberg (1553 and 1556), where he became personally acquainted with Melanchthon. To strengthen his order against attacks from Russia, he worked eagerly for an alliance with Poland, and became the foremost representative of the Polish party in Livonia. He soon overcame the opposition of Wilhelm Fürstenberg, the master of the order in Livonia, and in 1559 succeeded to his position. Kettler's main efforts were now directed toward a secularization of the order in Livonia after the model of Prussia (see Teutonic Order). The king of Poland would assist Livonia against the Russians only on condition of its entire submission to Polish rule, and under the force of circumstances Kettler had to comply with this demand; he became merely feudal duke of Courland (1562). As such he devoted his whole time and energy to the reform and regulation of ecclesiastical conditions in his state and achieved remarkable results. Church affairs in Courland were in a very entangled and neglected condition. The people had adopted Christianity only in an external form, and heathen traditions and superstitions still prevailed among them. The introduction of the Reformation had effected no essential change. A lack of preachers and churches obstructed all efforts toward a thorough-going reform. In 1567 the state assembly decreed at Kettler's instance the erection of seventy new churches. Church visitations were instituted, and Superintendent Alexander Eichhorn was commissioned to draw up a church order which was approved by the duke in 1570 and printed in 1572. The first part, the "Church Reformation," relates chiefly to the organization of the Church, to the foundation and maintenance of churches, schools and charitable institutions, and regulates the appointment of preachers and their visitation by the superintendent. In the second part, the "Church Visitation," the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church are treated as the norm of the Church, beside the Bible and the ecumenical symbols. Then follow the precepts for pastors in regard to their practical dealings with the congregation. The attendance at church was strictly controlled by the elders; fines and other punishments were to be imposed, and culprits to be delivered to the secular authorities if they did not change their lives. Church government was exercised in the beginning by the superintendents and visitators; a consistory was instituted later. (F. Hoerschelmann†.)

Bibliography: S. Henning, *Bericht wie es in Religionssachen im . . . Kurlandgehalten worden*, Rostock, 1589; T. Kallmeyer, *Die Begründung der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche in Kurland*, Riga, 1851; T. Schiemann, in *Historische Darstellungen und archivalische Studien*, p. 91, Hamburg-Mitau, 1886.

KEVIN, SAINT. See Cœmgen, Saint.

KEY, JOSEPH STAUNTON: Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; b. at La Grange, La., July 18, 1829. He was educated at Emory College, Oxford, Ga. (A.B., 1848), and was a pastor or presiding elder from the year of his graduation until 1886, when he was elected a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. In his official capacity he has made repeated tours of Mexico, China, Japan, and Korea.

KEYS, POWER OF THE.

I. Biblical Sources of the Doctrine.
II. The Patristic Period.
  Sub-Apostolic Views (§ 1).
  Extension of the Power (§ 2).
  Origen, Cyprian, and Augustine (§ 3).
  Sins Controlled by the Power (§ 4).
  Treatment of the Lapsed and Penitent (§ 5).
  The Power and the Priesthood (§ 6).
III. The Middle Ages and the Roman Catholic Doctrine.
  Penance (§ 1).
  The Priest as Judge or as Mediator (§ 2).
  Combination of the Two Views (§ 3).
  The Twofold Key and Thomas Aquinas (§ 4).
  The Tridentine Decree (§ 5).
  The Problem of Priestly Fallibility (§ 6).
  The Keys in the Greek Church (§ 7).
IV. The Reformation and the Protestant Doctrine.
  Luther and Melanchthon (§ 1).
  The Calvinistic Theory (§ 2).
  Lutheran Attacks on the Doctrine (§ 3).
  Theological Aspect of the Doctrine (§ 4).

I. Biblical Sources of the Doctrine: The "power of the keys" is a symbolical term which in its more extended sense denotes the whole range of the power of the Church, while in its restricted usage it connotes simply the power of granting or refusing absolution. The concept goes back to Christ's words to Peter (Matt. xvi. 19), "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." This is doubtless based on "the key of the house of David" mentioned in Isa. xxii. 22, and quoted in Rev. iii. 7, and implies that the steward of the house received the keys so that no one might open the door he had shut, or shut the door he had opened. This metaphor is not carried through in Matt. xvi. 19, but passages like Matt. xxiii. 13 and Luke xi. 52 prove that "binding and loosing" must have been related to the concept of admission and exclusion. In Matt. xviii. 18, where the power of binding and loosing is conferred upon all disciples as the representatives of the Church, the connection of the passage leaves no doubt that it refers to the exclusion of sinners from or the admission of penitents to the congregation. Nor can the similar words in Matt. xvi. 19 have an essentially different meaning, so that the concept of the early Church, which is shared by the Greek exegetes, can not be wrong in interpreting the passage by John xx. 23. It is especially to be emphasized that in both passages the disciples receive no commission of a new function, but are merely assured that the exercise of their former function is valid before God. It is still more desirable to interpret the passage in Matthew from the whole connection of the Synoptic Gospels, and it thus becomes plain that in consideration of such passages as Matt. xxiii. 8–10 we can not ascribe any legislative power to the disciples. The sense of the "power of the keys" seems to be, therefore, that Jesus gave Peter, or his disciples, or the body of Christian believers, authority to receive into the kingdom of heaven by forgiveness of sins or to exclude from it by refusal of pardon, thus forgiving sin (especially on earth) in the name of God and with efficacy with God in the same way as the Son of Man had hitherto exercised it (cf. Matt. ix. 6).

II. The Patristic Period: In the patristic period the "power of the keys" was held to connote strictly the remission (or retention) of sins, and not legal enactments. This is clear from Tertullian (*Scorpiace,* x.; *De pudicitia,* xxi.), from the letter of the churches at Lyons and Vienne (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.,* V., ii. 5), from Cyprian (*Epist.,* lxxiii. 7, lxxv. 16), and from other sources (Ambrose, *De pœnitentia,* i. 2; Augustine, *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum,* 136; Faustus of Riez, *Sermo* vi.; Leo the Great, *Sermo* xlix. 3; Apostolic Constitutions, ii. 11 sqq.). It would be erroneous to suppose that this was a narrowing of the concept. The development was rather in the opposite direction, for when the "power of the keys" came to be interpreted as a judicial act, especially in relation to the lapsed, the furtherance of the juristic aspect of the concept was easy. Thus the pseudo-Clementine Homilies (iii. 72; cf. Clement, *Epist. ad Jacobum,* 2) see in the "power to bind and loose" the functions of the episcopal office.

1. Sub-Apostolic Views.

While in the primitive Church the "power of the keys" may be regarded, roughly speaking, as ascribed to the Church, or to its officials, or to those endowed with the Spirit, in the sense that all three concurred, nevertheless the official element gradually superseded the other two. In this early period the "power of the keys" was indubitably possessed by the Church as a whole (cf. Tertullian, *Scorpiace,* 10; Cyprian, *Epist.,* lxxv. 16), the Church consisting of the bishops, the clergy, and the body of the faithful (Cyprian (*Epist.,* xxxiii. 1). Cyprian is the first to permit to the clergy what he ascribes to the Church, since "the Church is founded upon the bishops, and every act of the Church is controlled by these same rulers" (*Epist.,* xxxiii. 1), although he still maintains that "remission of sins can not be given by those who, it is certain, have not the Holy Spirit" (*Epist.,* lxix. 11). Elsewhere the idea is found (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.,* V., xviii. 7; Cyprian, *Epist.,* xviii. 1, xix. 2, xxxiii. 2; *De lapsis,* 19) that apostles and prophets, as well as martyrs, have the right to forgive sins as possessing the Holy Ghost. It is not clear, however, that they exercised this function without the cooperation of the other agents already mentioned, nor does Cyprian grant the martyrs more than intercessionary powers, the remission itself being granted by the priest (*De lapsis,* 16, 29; *Epist.,* lv. 24) who is "judge in the place of Christ" (*Epist.,* lix. 7). But these three classes were never held to be the sole decisive possessors of the "power of the keys," and Montanistic expressions contain indubitable innovations. Thus Tertullian mentions "God's dear ones" (*De pœnitentia,* 9) as those to whom the lapsed should kneel next after the presbyters. When, however, he grants the "power of the keys" to the "spiritual," whether prophets or apostles (*De pudicitia,* 21), he includes the Church, instead of excluding it, opposing only a priesthood in which he fails to find this spiritual characteristic.

2. Extension of the Power.

Alexandrine theology seems to have made little change. Origen, while energetically vindicating the "power of the keys" to Christians of true spiritual insight, presupposes, in the case of grievous faults, the participation of priests or bishops in the forgiveness of sins (*De oratione,* 28; Commentary on Matthew, xii. 14), thus restricting to them such a spiritual character. It is evident, moreover, that the "power of the keys" was held to be vested in the bishop (cf. Tertullian, *De baptismate,* 17; Apostolic Constitutions, ii. 11); but there is no evidence in Cyprian to show that Peter, to say nothing of his successors at Rome, had any prerogative of this power over other apostles or bishops (*Epist.,* lxxv. 16), his view being that Christ gave this privilege first to Peter, and then to his fellow apostles (*Epist.,* lix. 19; *De unitate,* 4). So according to Augustine, the keys were given to the Church, represented by Peter (*Epist.,* cxlix. 7, ccxcv. 2). The Church is administered by the bishops (*Sermo* cccli. 9), but it is the Holy Ghost which remits sins both "above man" and "through man" (*Sermo* xcix. 9). The bishops of Rome, however, laid special claims at an early date to the "power of the keys" in virtue of their succession to Peter (cf. Tertullian, *De pudicitia,* 1, 21; Cyprian, *Epist.,* lxxv. 17); while Leo the Great (on Matt. xvi. 19), maintaining the "privilege of Peter," held that the "power of the keys" was extended to the other apostles and to all the heads of the Church; and Optatus (*De schismate Donati,* vii. 3) believed that Peter received this prerogative that he might communicate it to the other apostles.

3. Origen, Cyprian and Augustine.

The "power of the keys" was used by the Church especially in the administration of baptism, and also in penance for grievous sins committed after baptism, more venial faults being atoned for by the daily penitence of the faithful heart, the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer, fasting, the oblations, and the Eucharist. Although the list of grievous sins was somewhat uncertain (cf. Tertullian, *De pudicitia*, 19; *Adversus Marcionem*, iv. 9; Augustine, *Sermo* cccli. 4; Pacianus, *Parænesis ad pænitentiam*, 3), practically idolatry, murder, and adultery were from the very first the chief objects of ecclesiastical discipline. The passages supposed to prove that in the Greek Church the belief was early prevalent that all sins might be forgiven (Clement, *Stromata*, ii. 13; Origen, *Contra Celsum*, iii. 51; Dionysius of Corinth in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, iv. 23, 6) are too vague to admit of this interpretation; and while it is clear, from Tertullian's *De pudicitia* that no rigid rule was followed with respect to carnal sins, he states as a general principle (*De pudicitia*, 12; cf. 22 and Origen, *De oratione*, xxviii.) that idolatry and murder were considered unpardonable.

4. Sins Controlled by the Power.

The Western Church, on the other hand, steadily extended pardon to all sins, thus connecting the "power of the keys" more closely with the episcopal office. After 250 even the lapsed (see Lapsi) were admitted to pardon, thus postulating forgiveness for idolatry, although in many regions the more rigid practise was retained as in Spain at the beginning of the fourth century and at Cæsarea in Cappadocia. Pardon for a second lapse, however, was forbidden by Pope Siricius and was unknown to Augustine (*Epist.* cliii. 7), besides being rejected by the eleventh canon of the third Synod of Toledo, although Sozomen had already declared his conviction that "God has decreed that pardon should be extended to the penitent, even after many transgressions" (*Hist. eccl.*, vii. 16).

5. Treatment of the Lapsed and Penitent.

As a matter of fact the "power of the keys" was exercised by the clergy under the supervision of the bishop, and the laity took no further part as early as the middle of the third century (cf. Cyprian, *Epist.*, xix. 2, xlix., lix. 15; Augustine, *Sermo* cccli.). After excommunication and penance for a mortal sin, the penitent was again received into the Church. This act was termed reconciliation, and was performed by the laying on of hands, prayer, and the kiss of peace by the bishop, assisted by the clergy before the altar in the presence of the congregation. The pardoning power of the Church thus coincided with absolution (see Confession), though not in the medieval sense, since the atoning force of penance rested in the act of the penitent himself, not in the reconciling power of the Church. While God alone forgave sins, the Church, as his merciful institution, could not refuse her cooperation, but pointed out to the penitent the way in which the wound of sin might be healed. Then evolved the attitude represented by Cyprian: "Outside the Church there is no salvation," even though the absolving power of the Church was not final, but must be confirmed at the Last Judgment, thus requiring prayer and the laying on of hands.

Beginning with Augustine, the tendency arises to bring the priest's activity in the exercise of the "power of the keys" into closer connection with divine grace; and the sinner is no longer considered as a wounded man to be healed, but as a corpse to be revived. Since this is impossible for the Church, a preliminary working of grace in the heart is assumed, which is later to be completed by the operation of the "power of the keys." While Augustine bases forgiveness in reconciliation simply on the petition of the congregation of the faithful, Leo the Great regards the priests as the specific intercessors for the fallen, basing his view on Matt. xxviii. 20, which he restricts to the clergy (*Epist.*, lxxxii.; *Ad Theodorum*, 2).

6. The Power and the Priesthood.

The Roman Catholic concept of a clerical priesthood independent of the laity, and with whose mediation all works of grace are connected, thus received sharp and conscious expression, and the accretions of later times are but the development of the basal idea of Leo. There was, however, as yet no formal pronouncement of absolution. An entirely different view is advanced by other Fathers. On the basis of Lev. xiv. 2 sqq., Jerome (Commentary on Matthew, iii.) held that ecclesiastical authority possessed merely the right to decide that they were set free whom the inward grace of God had freed, and that they were bound whom divine grace had not set free. Very similar are the terms used by Gregory the Great (*Homilia xxvi. in Evangelia*, 6), but it is clear from his own statements how little this theoretic distinction practically implied.

III. The Middle Ages and the Roman Catholic Doctrine: The primitive Church distinguished between three classes of members—the faithful, catechumens, and penitents. The "power of the keys" was established chiefly for the third class, though in some respects also for the second; for these two classes alone stood in need of ecclesiastical reconciliation or absolution. Early in the Middle Ages, however, a tendency arose among the newly converted Germanic peoples to make penance, which originally was a special institution for special occasions, a general characteristic of the whole Church, and to establish the "power of the keys," which originally dealt with penitents only, as a general court of judicature above all the faithful. The first indication of this tendency was that, through monastic discipline, sins in thought gradually became subject to the "power of the keys," deviating herein from the practise of the early Church. In the monasteries it was considered a rule of discipline to confess to the brethren even the slightest occurrences of sinful emotions. The penitential of the Irish Vinnians prescribes for sins in thought a rigid fast for half a year, and abstinence from wine and meat for a whole year. The Anglo-Saxon penitential, which bears the name of Theodore of Canterbury, prescribes from twenty to forty days' fast for feeling lust. This system was introduced into the Frankish Church by St. Columban of Luxeuil (q.v.) and his pupils, and received the support of the Frankish bishops, as is evidenced by the eighth canon of the Synod of Chalon-sur-Saône (after 644). It must also be noted, however, that as early as the fifth century, Johannes Cassianus of Marseilles (q.v.), a semi-Pelagian influenced by Eastern monasticism, had postulated eight "principal sins" of thought,

1. Penance.

which later developed into the seven deadly sins of scholasticism. The first provincial synod which made confession a general duty was that of Aenham (1109), and Innocent III. (1198–1216) finally introduced confession, and the consequent extension of the "power of the keys" over all Christians, throughout the Church in spite of the opposition which the penitentials produced in France, his evident object being to check the growth of heresy. The result was a radical change in the treatment of penance and reconciliation; for whereas since the fourth century reconciliation had invariably been public, while private penance had been prescribed for secret sins, private penance was now restricted to cases of voluntary private confession; and public penance (followed by public reconciliation, gradually termed absolution) was reserved for open sins attested by witnesses, or for such heinous crimes as murder (Councils of Arles [813], canon 26; Châlon-sur-Saône [813], canon 25; Mainz [847], canon 31; Pavia [850], canon 6; Mainz [852], canon 10 sqq.; *Capitularia Regum Francorum*, ed. S. Baluze, Paris, 1677, v. 112). Public penance and reconciliation still remained the prerogative of the bishop, while private confession and absolution were delegated to the priests, though only as the delegates of the bishop (cf. Ratramnus, *contra Græcorum opposita*, iv. 7; *Capitularia Regum Francorum*, vi. 206). Whereas, moreover, reconciliation primarily followed immediately after the completion of penance, the penitential of Gildas (§ 1) permitted private reconciliation on the expiration of half the period of penance, and that of Theodore of Canterbury after a year or six months (i. 12, § 4), while in the so-called Statutes of Boniface (cap. 31) reconciliation must immediately follow confession. In the course of the Middle Ages, however, public penance and public reconciliation—the latter performed in the Roman Church on Maundy Thursday as early as the fifth century, and on Good Friday in the Milanese and Spanish churches —were steadily superseded by private confession and private absolution, so that since the Reformation they have become entirely antiquated.

2. The Priest as Judge or as Mediator.

With regard to the theological definition of absolution, and the share of the priest in its administration, two opposing views, inherited from the patristic period, run almost parallel with each other during the first part of the Middle Ages. According to the one, the priest is simply judge *in foro ecclesiæ;* he declares that forgiveness has taken place by the act of divine grace in the penitent soul, but takes no part himself in the act of forgiving. The divine forgiveness takes place before the absolution by the priest, and even before confession, in the very moment the heart repents; so that the Church's absolution is but the declaration of what God has already done. How prominent this view was, even in the thirteenth century, may be seen from the manner in which Gratian treats the subject. He raises the question whether a sinner can satisfy God by repentance and secret penance without confession, then states the arguments and authorities on both sides, and finally leaves the reader to decide the question for himself. Peter the Lombard, the contemporary of Gratian, defines (iv. 17) the priest's power to bind and to loose merely as a power of declaration, signifying simply he loosed before the Church him who was loosed in the sight of God. Similar but still more explicit were the views of Cardinal Robert Pulleyn (*Sent.* vi. 52, 61, vii. 1) and Peter of Poitiers, chancellor of the University of Paris (d. about 1204). According to the other view, represented by Leo the Great and Alcuin, the priest is not simply a judge *in foro ecclesiæ*, but is a mediator, intercessor and reconciler between God and the penitent. This position, taken by the priests throughout the penitentials, and exercising a profound influence on the development of the doctrine of the "power of the keys," attained increased importance in the *De vera et falsa pœnitentia*, a work belonging to the eleventh or twelfth century, but ascribed to Augustine. Here the priest appears as the representative of God in confession, and his forgiveness is the forgiveness of God; while the view of Gregory the Great, that sins in themselves beyond forgiveness become forgivable through penance (but not through absolution), is here modified so that the sinner in his confession does not become clean in the sight of God, but has his mortal sin changed to venial. This residue of venial sins no longer involves eternal punishment, but must be atoned for either by penance on earth or purgatory after death (chaps. 25, 35). These concepts were now evolved into a formal system by the Victorines. To Hugo of St. Victor the priest represents the humanity of Christ, is the visible medium needed by sin-bound man to draw near to God, and is used by God to pour his grace into the human heart. Thus the priestly absolution not only declares forgiveness, but effects it (*De sacramentis*, ii. 1 sqq., 8). Hugo regards the sinner as bound by the inner bondage of hardness of heart and the outer chain of merited damnation, the former loosed by God alone through contrition, and the latter by the priest as the divine instrument. Going still further, Hugo's pupil, Richard of St. Victor, in his *De potestate ligandi et solvendi* held that God himself released from sin either immediately or through the mediation of men who were not necessarily priests, this being done by contrition even before confession. He also held that through the priest, who possessed the "power of the keys," God transformed eternal punishment into a transitory one, and that the priest transformed transitory punishment into penance.

3. Combination of the Two Views.

In the case of two views so divergent, yet running parallel, further progress could be possible only in their dialectic reconciliation and combination. This was attained by the great scholastics of the thirteenth century, especially by Thomas Aquinas, although Richard of St. Victor had plainly sought to effect such a result. In his *Summa theologiæ* (pars iv., quæstio 20, membrum iii., art. 2; quæstio 21, membrum i.; membrum ii., arts. 1–3) Alexander of Hales, closely followed by Bonaventura and Albertus Magnus, held that, while the power to bind and to loose belonged to God alone, the priest merely praying for and obtaining absolution, but not imparting it, nevertheless, the priest, as the medium between the sinner and God, being the spokesman both of the sinner and of God, was deprecator and judge in one. Eternal punishment can not be remitted by the priest, but only by God. On the other hand, the "power of the keys" extends to temporal punishment, since the priest is a divinely appointed judge; while purgatory is remitted only *per accidens*, the priest being able to change the pains of purgatory into temporal punishment, and thus into penance.

4. The Twofold Key and Thomas Aquinas.

On this basis Thomas Aquinas completed the Roman Catholic doctrine of the "power of the keys." He distinguished between the *clavis ordinis* and the *clavis jurisdictionis* (*Summa*, quæstio 19, art. 3, resp.), the former, received by the priest in his ordination, opening heaven immediately to individuals through sacramentary absolution; and the latter having this effect only through excommunication and absolution before the forum of the Church. The *clavis ordinis* alone having a sacramental nature, laymen and deacons may possess the *clavis jurisdictionis*, which also includes the granting of indulgences (quæstio 25, art. 2 ad 1 m.). The exercise of the *clavis ordinis* presupposes the possession of the *clavis jurisdictionis;* but, on the other hand, the *clavis ordinis* becomes effective only through the *clavis jurisdictionis* (quæstio 20, art. 1–2, resp.), so that by depriving schismatics, heretics, and the like of the *clavis jurisdictionis*, a bishop may withdraw from them the power of exercising the *clavis ordinis* (quæstio 19, art. 6, resp.). The sacramental *clavis ordinis* finds its exercise in priestly absolution, and it was through Thomas Aquinas that the individual elements of the sacrament of penance were united in the Roman Catholic doctrine of the "power of the keys." He bases his view on the concept that God alone remits sin and eternal punishment as a return for a contrition which is perfected by fulness of love and by a desire for sacramental confession and absolution. Such a penitent has the grace given him increased by the "power of the keys"; and in case his contrition is not sufficiently deep, the same power removes the obstacles to the entrance of the atoning grace, provided the sinner himself sets up no opposing barriers. The "power of the keys" remits a portion of the temporal punishment, the residue being atoned for by the prayers, alms, and fasting prescribed to the penitent by the priest as satisfaction (quæstio 18, art. 2–3). These latter, moreover, may be remitted by the *clavis jurisdictionis* through indulgences (quæstio 25, art. 1, resp.), which, in view of the concept of vicarious satisfaction on which they are based, may be used for the benefit of souls in purgatory. This development of the "power of the keys" essentially changed the form of absolution; for although Alexander of Hales states that in his time the deprecatory formula was followed by the indicative, the latter must have been an innovation, since until thirty years before Thomas Aquinas the formula used by all priests had been *Absolutionem et remissionem tibi tribuat Deus*. He himself defended the use of *Ego te absolvo* on its analogy to the other sacraments, and as exactly expressing the effect of the sacrament of penance and the "power of the keys," even though retaining the deprecatory formula as a prayer before the indicative, a usage still followed by the *Rituale Romanum*.

5. The Tridentine Decree.

The teaching of Thomas Aquinas on the "power of the keys" was essentially adopted by Eugene IV. at the Council of Florence (1439) and still more fully by the fourteenth session of the Council of Trent (Nov. 25, 1551). While the Decree (cap. 6) and the Canons (9–10) of the Council of Trent declare that the absolution is not a mere statement of forgiveness, but is a judicial and sacramental act, the Roman Catechism makes the "power of the keys" extend to all sins without exception (i. 11, 5), while the absolution pronounced by the priest, who represents in all sacraments the person of Christ, actually effects the forgiveness of sins (ii. 5, 10, 11, 17). While, moreover, in contrition, confession, and satisfaction the penitent is active (*opus operans*), he is absolutely passive and receptive toward absolution, which works entirely *ex opere operato*.

6. The Problem of Priestly Fallibility.

From another point of view, the Roman Catholic priest is essentially a judge, not only *in foro ecclesiæ*, but *in foro Dei*. In this capacity he investigates the sins of the penitent to determine their proper punishment, and considers the spiritual state of him who makes confession, that he may know whether to bind or loose. Since, however, on the one hand, the formula *Ego te absolvo* implies that the absolution is infallible and absolute; while, on the other hand, the possible error of the priest, the infrequency of his ability to know completely the state of his penitent's soul, and the insufficiency of confession as a substitute for omniscience, render his decision only conditional, Roman Catholic dogmatics wavers as a result of the combination, without true union, of the two courses of development sketched above. Practically, however, the entire remission of sins requires from the penitents only contrition (repentance made perfect in love), confession, and satisfaction. For contrition is substituted attrition (mere fear of punishment), and what it lacks in earnestness and depth is made up by confession in its entirety and by absolution. The latter transmutes eternal punishment into temporal, and temporal into penance, this being remitted by indulgences. Thus the infallible judgment of the priest becomes fallible only in the case of the deliberate hypocrite; and the one firm and immutable result of the confused course of development here sketched is the infallibility of the power of the Church to bind and loose, the single unalterable kernel of the entire dogma of the "power of the keys" and of the sacrament of penance.

In the Greek Church private confession was introduced for the monks by Basil (d. 379); and from about the end of the iconoclastic controversy (see Images and Image Worship, II.) until the middle of the thirteenth century the "power of the keys" was vested exclusively in the monks according to their ecclesiastical grade. Collision with the priest-

7. The Keys in the Greek Church.

hood was avoided by ordaining monks as priests and appointing them as confessors; but since the thirteenth century, without annulling the prerogatives of the monks, the "power of the keys" has gradually been taken from the monastic orders and entrusted to the priests; while, under Roman Catholic influence, penance has become a sacrament. The doctrines of the Greek Church in this respect, however, have remained more general than the Roman Catholic, and have not assumed so juristic a character.

IV. The Reformation and the Protestant Doctrine: The entire concept of the "power of the keys" was transformed by the Reformation, Luther especially representing a return to early beliefs. Holding that the "power of the keys" was not legalistic, but denoted simply the forgiveness or retention of sins, he emphasized its entirely spiritual character as contrasted with its secular usage.

1. Luther and Melanchthon.

He taught, moreover, that it concerned the personal relation of the sinner to God, and that it opened or closed the path to sharing in the divine grace, and was not a mode of punishment. As a power conferred on man by God or Christ, it belonged to the Church, this being not the pope or the clergy, but the body of the faithful who have the Holy Spirit. While, however, in theory every Christian has this power and can exercise it in the name of the Church, practically only one commissioned by the Church may do so, again in the name of the Church, and as obeying God and acting in his stead. The spiritual Church thus becomes a mediator between the individual and God. The key of binding proclaims the unrepentant sinner doomed to eternal death; but if he repents, the key of loosing pronounces him free from sin and renews the promise of everlasting life (*Von den Schlüsseln*, Erlangen edition, xxxi. 178). The "power of the keys" is exercised by the Church first in preaching, the preaching of the law binding and the preaching of the Gospel loosing; in public and private absolution; and in excommunication, or prohibition to receive the Sacrament or to share in the other blessings of the Church until repentance and amendment, although the person so excommunicated was not to be prevented from hearing sermons. All forgiveness was conditioned by faith, but excommunication was to be pronounced only on gross and open sinners, who were to permit this judgment of God and the Church to work in them to repentance. Melanchthon agreed with Luther in his doctrine of the "power of the keys," and maintained the right of the Church to appoint officials to exercise it. He insisted, moreover, on confession and absolution before receiving the Sacrament, and, influenced by Roman Catholicism, he distinguished the "power of the keys," as a *potestas jurisdictionis,* from the *potestas ordinis.* He likewise held that the "power of the keys" belonged, at least in practise, to the clergy, while the Reformed concept of the Church regarded her as the essential possessor of this power.

2. The Calvinistic Theory.

The divergent view of the "power of the keys" held by the Reformed, and especially by Calvin, was intimately connected with their distinction between the invisible Church of the predestined and the visible Church which was to be organized and ruled according to the word of God; additional elements being the line drawn between the divine and the created factors of salvation and a concept by which forgiveness of sins presupposed only the true renewal by the Holy Ghost in regeneration. Accordingly, Calvin, distinguishing between Matt. xvi. and John xx. on the one hand and Matt. xviii. on the other, postulated a double "power of the keys" (*Institutes,* IV., xi. 1). Proceeding from the theory of individual need and individual pastoral care, he approximates the Lutheran idea of the consolation of private absolution (III., iv. 14, IV., i. 22) although this never gains the importance of an actual absolution. From this "power of the keys," which rests in the "ministry of the word" (cf. III., iv. 14, IV., vi. 4), must be distinguished the "spiritual jurisdiction and discipline" of the Church, which concerns the punishment meted out by the Church as a theocratic and secular institution. It is clear that here there is no question of a direct relation to God. Despite the difficulty of the reconciliation of Calvin's view with the promises of Christ regarding the "power of the keys," his double interpretation was retained in the Reformed confessions, as in the Helvetic Confession, 14, and the Heidelberg Catechism, 83. The Council of Trent, on the other hand, in its opposition to the Reformation, while abandoning the old theory of the two keys, retained the substance of the ancient dogma (session xxiii. 1); and postulated still more explicitly that the "power of the keys" was a prerogative granted by Christ to Peter and his successors.

3. Lutheran Attacks on the Doctrine.

In the Evangelical churches, and especially the Lutheran, the exercise of the "power of the keys" became more and more restricted to the clergy, who used it, on the one hand, in private absolution after a general confession, and, on the other, as a punishment in the form of excommunication, though, as a matter of fact, the latter was restricted by the consistories to carnal sins. Gradually, however, protests were raised against the "power of the keys," in part through a more or less mistaken idea regarding the Reformatory concept of the consolation and the sacramental signification of the forgiveness of sins. The pioneer of this tendency was Theophilus Grossgebauer, who required only confession to God for secret sins, but held public confession and reconciliation to be necessary for open sins, in which alone he believed the power to bind and loose to be effective, judgment being exercised by a body of elders chosen by the congregations concerned. Spener sought to transform private confession and absolution into a declaration before the pastor for counsel and spiritual investigation; but insisted that only the penitent might be absolved, doubtful cases being referred to a body of elders for judgment. While he held that the "power of the keys" belonged to the entire Church or brotherhood, and had wrongly become restricted to the clergy and the authorities, his followers assailed private confession still more vigorously. On Nov. 16, 1698, as a result of the diatribes of Johann Kaspar Schade of Berlin, an electoral resolution made general confession and absolution binding on all, private confession and absolution being left to the discretion of the individual. Prussia's example was followed by the other national Churches; and what Pietism began rationalism completed. This development diminished the stress laid on the concept of the " power of the keys." Schleiermacher, though reintroducing it into dogmatics, restricted it, with the express exception of the sermon, to the legal and judicial authority of the Church. He was closely followed by Dorner; but, on the other hand, the " Neo-Lutherans " of the nineteenth century endeavored to revive the " power of the keys " as a specific attribute of the pastoral office which had succeeded the apostolate, only to meet the opposition of the Erlangen school.

4. Theological Aspect of the Doctrine.

From the point of view of dogmatics the " power of the keys " may be defined as the duty and the authority of the spiritual Church to make the everlasting decision for mankind and for individuals dependent on the relation to her as the body of Christ. In this sense it presupposes not only special and general absolution, but the entire administration of the sacraments; and this must be exercised in the Holy Ghost. The determination of its concrete forms and its transmission from the spiritual to the earthly Church falls within the province of practical theology. Naturally, however, the " power of the keys " can be ignored only where the Church is regarded merely as a religious association based on the pious thoughts of men; but not where it is held to have arisen from the determination and the participation of the living God. (Johannes Kunze.)

Bibliography: J. Morin, *Commentarius historicus de disciplina in administratione sacramenti poenitentiae*, Antwerp, 1692; J. Waterworth, *The Faith of Catholics*, i. 98 sqq., iii. 1–25, London, 1846; C. Elliott, *Delineation of Roman Catholicism*, ed. Hannah, ib. 1851; F. W. H. Wasserschleben, *Die Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche*, Halle, 1851; G. Steitz, *Das römische Bussakrament*, Frankfort, 1854; idem, *Die Privatbeichte und Privatabsolution*, ib. 1854; idem, in *TSK*, 1866, pp. 435–483; T. Kliefoth, *Beichte und Absolution*, Schwerin, 1856; G. F. Pfisterer, *Luthers Lehre von der Beichte*, Stuttgart, 1857; J. Barrow, *A Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy*, ed. A. Napier, pp. 94, 145 et passim, Cambridge, 1859; J. Bowen, *The Power of the Keys and the Athanasian Creed*, London, 1860; H. L. Ahrens, *Das Amt der Schlüssel*, Hanover, 1864; F. Frank, *Die Bussdisciplin*, Mainz, 1867; F. Probst, *Sakramente und Sakramentalien*, Tübingen, 1872; E. Löning, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenrechts*, [i. 252 sqq., ii. 448 sqq., Strasburg, 1878; H. J. Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher und die Bussdisciplin der Kirche*, Mainz, 1883; H. C. Lea, *A Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary in the 13th Century*, Philadelphia, 1892; K. Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchthum*, Leipsic, 1898; F. H. Foster, *Fundamental Ideas of the Roman Catholic Church*, pp. 41–42, 284, Philadelphia, 1899; J. Köstlin, *Luthers Theologie*, ii. 245 sqq., Stuttgart, 1901; Neander, *Christian Church*, ii. 200, iii.–v. passim; *KL*, x. 1834–39; *DCG*, i. 929.

KHLYSTY. See Russia, III., § 4.

KIDRON: A valley or ravine east of Jerusalem, now known as Wadi Sitti Maryam (" Valley of St. Mary "). At present it is always dry except occasionally after severe rains in the winter (see Jerusalem). The name (Hebr. *ḳidhron*) occurs eleven times in the Old Testament and once (John xviii. 1) in the New Testament, where the A. V. has " the brook Cedron " (following the Greek form, *kedrōn*), the R. V. " the brook Kidron." The marginal reading of the R. V., "of the Cedars," is a possible translation of the Greek, but not applicable to a Hebrew word; *ḳidhron* is usually referred to the root *ḳadhar*, " to be dark, gloomy."

KIEF, kî'ef (**KIEW, KIJEW**): A city of Russia, on the Dnieper, noted in ecclesiastical history as an ancient metropolitan see, the cradle of the Russian Church. In 1320 it came into the possession of the Lithuanians, and thus in 1386 became part of the kingdom of Poland, which ceded it to Russia in 1686. Greek missionaries were the first to preach Christianity in this region, and Christians are found there as early as the beginning of the tenth century. After the conversion of Vladimir in 988, the Greek patriarch sent thither the first archbishop, Michael, a Syrian by birth (988–992). Under the episcopate of Theopemptus (1035–47) the great cathedral of St. Sophia was built, and the province then included twelve dioceses, to which Smolensk was added in 1137. Early in the twelfth century the relations of the see with Rome became more and more strained. Under Matthew (1200–20) Kief was destroyed by the Mongolian invaders, and in 1299 the see was formally transferred to Vladimir, and under Peter (1308–26) to Moscow, the old title being still retained of " metropolitan of Kief and all Russia." Under Gregory I. (1416–19) the Ruthenian Church was completely separated from Moscow and Constantinople, and he seems to have been disposed to promote a reunion with Rome and to have attended the Council of Constance. Isidore (1437–58) took more decisive steps in the same direction, labored diligently for the reunion scheme of the Council of Ferrara-Florence, and died a cardinal and (Latin) patriarch-elect of Constantinople in 1463. But the reunion project found little favor among the people, and a state of schism and conflict followed, the union being wholly dissolved at the death of Joseph II. (1498–1517) under the influence of Helen, the Russian wife of King Alexander II., who instigated the employment of harsh measures against its adherents. In 1595, however, the metropolitan of Kief with all his eight suffragans, decided once more to look to Rome for help against the disorders of the times, and Clement VIII. received them, permitting them to retain their own ecclesiastical language and customs. By the influence of Moscow a rival line of Greek metropolitans was kept up until 1707 without a break. The successive divisions of Poland and the anti-Roman influence of the Empress Catherine II. tended to weaken the position of the Uniat Church in the eighteenth century, and under Russian pressure in 1839 most of its adherents returned to the communion of Moscow. In 1771 they had numbered twelve millions; in 1834 scarcely a million and a half were left.

Bibliography: M. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 1257–1282, iii. 1127 sqq., Paris, 1740; C. G. Friese, *De episcopatu Kiovensi*, Warsaw, 1763; L. Lescoeur, *L'Église* *catholique en Pologne*, Paris, 1860; A. Pichler, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung*, ii. 1 sqq., Munich, 1864; J. Pelesz, *Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom*, 2 vols., Vienna, 1878–80; L. K. Goetz, *Das Kiever Höhlenkloster als Kulturzentrum des vormongolischen Russlands*, Passau, 1904; *KL*, vii. 428–446 (a full article). Further material will be found in the literature under Poland; Russia. On the two councils of the Eastern Church held there consult: E. H. Landon, *Manual of Councils*, London, 1846; A. N. Mouravieff, *Hist. of the Church of Russia*, pp. 35, 179, Oxford, 1842.

KIERAN, SAINT. See Ciaran, Saint.

KIERKEGAARD, kyer′ke-gōrd, **SÖREN AABY:** Danish philosopher and religious author; b. in Copenhagen May 5, 1813; d. there Nov. 11, 1855. He was matriculated at the University of Copenhagen in 1830, and took up the study of theology, devoting also considerable time to philosophy and esthetics. His first literary product was a small pamphlet in which he attacked Hans Christian Andersen, contending that the latter was mistaken in making the hero of his " Only a Fiddler " a peevish nature, and maintaining that genius can know of no defeat, but that, like a thunder-shower, it will force itself against the wind. This utterance may serve as a specimen of Kierkegaard's thought. In 1840 he obtained his first degree in theology, and in the following year the master's degree for a dissertation on the conception of irony, with special reference to Socrates. Shortly afterward, he went to Berlin. He wished to demonstrate the truth of Christianity, but not, like other apologists, by explaining its dogmas. On Feb. 20, 1843, the first part of his large work " Whether—Or " appeared pseudonymously, rapidly followed by the second part, entitled " Neither," in which he answers the question propounded by himself as to whether the esthetical or the ethical type of life ought to be chosen. Between 1843 and 1846 numerous other works appeared from his pen, of which may be mentioned " Fear and Trembling," " Bits of Philosophy," " What is Fear ?" and " Stations on the Path of Life," in all of which he conceals his identity behind various alleged contemporary authors, representing himself as merely the publisher of their pseudonymous literature. Only his sermons were published over his own name.

The first part of these works endeavors to impress the solemnity of Christianity upon an age which lived, either without Christianity, or with a Christianity founded on custom only. The theme " only the truth which builds is worth having " forms the substance of the entire pseudonymous literature published by Kierkegaard, and by his treatment of this theme he became a religious reviver of great importance. His positive construction of Christianity, however, did not fail to find opponents. Dogmatically he defined Christianity as the paradox; ethically, as unmixed suffering; psychologically, as a passionate departure from the ways of the world. He rejected the ideas of creed, church, priest, etc., and according to his conception a Christian is an isolated individual, alone with God, and in contact with the world only through suffering. When this part of his literary activity was completed he felt as though he had fulfilled his mission, and desired to retire to a secluded parsonage; the attacks of which he now became the subject in the press, however, led his activity into a new channel, and the mental suffering which he had endured led him to consider the influence which mental agony exerts upon the life of a Christian. The fundamental idea in his subsequent writings became more religious, more Christian; his sermons treated of the gospel of suffering.

From his early childhood Kierkegaard had regarded the old bishop of Zealand, J. P. Mynster (q.v.), with great reverence, for the latter had been " his father's pastor." But now that he had come to consider it the duty of a Christian to lead a life of suffering he asked himself if Mynster's preaching was not rather an esthetic misrepresentation of the paradox and the gospel of suffering than true Christianity; and was Mynster's life a martyrdom? For a long time Kierkegaard hoped that Mynster would admit that the Christian ideal had been correctly defined in his writings, and also that he, the primate of the Danish church, did not live according to this ideal. Mynster, however, maintained silence, and as Kierkegaard did not wish to disturb the old prelate's tranquillity of mind he also refrained from uttering his opinions. On the death of Mynster, however, a sermon preached by Martensen, in which the latter designated the late bishop as " a faithful witness of truth," aroused Kierkegaard's ire, and he wrote a protest, the publication of which, however, he delayed for some time. But when Martensen, nine months later, was appointed Mynster's successor as bishop of Zealand this protest appeared in the periodical *Fædrelandet* of Dec. 18, 1854, under the title " Was Bishop Mynster a Witness of Truth, a Faithful Witness of Truth—Is this Truth ? " Martensen practically ignored this attack, simply stigmatizing Kierkegaard as a Thersites who danced upon the tombs of heroes; this, however, enraged Kierkegaard all the more, and he returned to the attack with various articles and brochures in all of which he censured " official Christendom," its divine services, its religious acts, and its adherents. As an advocate of individualism Kierkegaard had no sympathy for the multitude, or for the awakening tendency to organization. The enormous mental strain which his attack on organized Christianity had necessitated left him physically weak, and hastened his death. Kierkegaard's works have established in Denmark a literature so rich, so original, and so complete in form that it is absolutely without parallel in that country. (F. Nielsen†.)

Bibliography: Selections from Kierkegaard's unpublished papers, which throw much light upon his books, ed. H. P. Barsod and H. Gottsched, appeared in 8 vols. at Copenhagen, 1869–81. His "Works," ed. A. B. Drachmann, J. L. Heiberg, and O. H. Lange, appeared, 14 vols., Copenhagen, 1901–1906. There are biographies in Danish by G. Brandes, Copenhagen, 1877, Germ. transl., Leipsic, 1879; C. Koch, Copenhagen, 1898; P. A. Rosenberg, Copenhagen, 1898. Of the voluminous literature, mention may be made of A. Bärthold, *Sören Kierkegaard, eine Verfasser-Existenz eigener Art*, Halberstadt, 1873; idem, *Aus und über Sören Kierkegaard*, ib. 1874; idem, *Noten zu Sören Kierkegaard's Lebensgeschichte*, Halle, 1876; idem, *Die Bedeutung der ästhetischen Schriften Sören Kierkegaard's*, ib. 1879; idem, *Sören Kierkegaard's Persönlichkeit in ihrer Verwicklung der Ideale*, Gütersloh, 1886; V. Deleuran, *Esquisse d'une étude sur Sören Kierkegaard*, Paris, 1897; *Ausgewählte christliche Reden*, German by Julie von Reincke, with an account of

his family and life from personal reminiscences of his niece, Giessen, 1901; P. Münch, *Die Haupt- und Grundgedanken der Philosophie Sören Kierkegaards*, Leipsic, 1902.

KILHAM, ALEXANDER: Founder of the Methodist New Connection, frequently called Kilhamites; b. at Epworth (21 m. n.n.w. of Lincoln), Lincolnshire, July 10, 1762; d. at Nottingham Dec. 20, 1798. He began to preach in 1783, and was received by Wesley into the regular itinerant ministry in 1785. On the death of Wesley (1791) he became an energetic leader of the faction favoring complete separation of the Methodists from the Church of England and published a number of rather violent pamphlets in support of his views. At the conference held in London in 1792 he was censured, and at the conference of 1796, also held in London, he was unanimously expelled from the conference. On Aug. 9, 1797, Kilham met three other Methodist clergymen and a number of laymen at Leeds and organized the Methodist New Connection. See METHODISTS, I., 3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His *Life* (written by himself) was edited with a preface by J. Grundell, and R. Hall, Nottingham, 1799; [J. Blackwell,] *Life of Rev. Alexander Kilham*, London, 1838; W. J. Townsend, *Alexander Kilham, the First Methodist Reformer*, ib. 1890; *DNB*, xxxi. 102–103.

KILIAN, SAINT: Irish cleric in Germany, who, with several companions, met a martyr's death at Würzburg in the eighth century. He is called Bishop Chilianus in a necrology of the time and in the martyrology of Rabanus is spoken of as coming from Ireland to preach the Gospel of Christ in those regions and meeting death because of his faith. There are difficulties connected with the tradition, not the least being that the Franks dwelling on the middle Main were no longer a pagan people and Kilian's labors, therefore, were not those of a missionary. Only the fact of the Celtic bishop's violent death is undoubted; the exact period of his martyrdom at the hands of a *Dux* or a Judge Gozbert can not be verified. Concerning the form of the name " Kilian " the following seems to be well established. The Ch of the " Chilianus " in the oldest authority is to be ascribed to the regular working of the laws of Germanic phonology. Irish names ending in an, iane, ene are always nicknames, appellatives, etc., as in the case of the abbot of Armagh, about 640, addressed by Pope John V. as Tomian and Tomene. The old Irish cell (gen. *celle*, dat. and acc. *cill*, c being always pronounced like k) signified the cell of an anchorite, a monastery or a church, and Cellan and Cillene were common names among the Irish clergy in the seventh and eighth centuries, signifying " anchorite." On the analogy of Tomian and Tomene, Killian, spelled with two l's might properly be regarded as a variant of Cillene. The difficulty presented by the fact that the Frankish form is Kilian, with single l, may be explained by supposing the substitution for the liquid double l of a single letter bearing the same sound. St. Kilian's reputation dates from the time of Burchard, bishop of Würzburg (d. about 754). (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: An early *Vita*, with comment, is in *ASB*, July, ii., 599–614. Consult: T. D. Hardy, *Descriptive Catalogue of Materials*, i. 1, p. 339, in *Rolls Series*, no. 26, London, 1862; W. D. Killen, *Ecclesiastical Hist. of Ireland*, 2 vols., London, 1875; H. Zimmer, *The Irish Element in Mediæval Culture*, New York, 1891; Rettberg, *KD*, ii. 303; Hauck, *KD*, i. 370; *DCB*, i. 544–555; *KL*, vii. 446–448; *DNB*, x. 363–364.

KILLEN, WILLIAM DOOL: Irish Presbyterian; b. at Ballymena (23 m. n.w. of Belfast), County Antrim, Apr. 5, 1806; d. at Belfast Jan. 10, 1902. He studied at the Belfast Academical Institution, and in 1829 was ordained minister of Raphoe, County Donegal. From 1841 he was professor of church history and pastoral theology, and from 1869 until his death was president of the Presbyterian College, Belfast. In theology he was a liberal Evangelical. He wrote: *The Ancient Church* (London, 1859); *Memorial of John Edgar* (Belfast, 1867); *The Old Catholic Church from the Apostolic Age to A.D. 755* (Edinburgh, 1871); *The Ecclesiastical History of Ireland from the Earliest Period to the Present Time* (2 vols., London, 1875); *The Ignatian Letters Entirely Spurious* (Edinburgh, 1886); *The Framework of the Church: A Treatise on Church Government* (1890); and *Reminiscences of a Long Life* (London, 1901); he also continued J. S. Reid's *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland from 1733* (Belfast, 1853).

KILWARDBY, ROBERT: Archbishop of Canterbury; b. in England c. 1200; d. at Viterbo (42 m. n.n.w. of Rome), Italy, Sept. 11, 1279. He probably studied at Oxford, but certainly at the University of Paris, where he first distinguished himself as a lecturer and writer on grammar and logic. Later he joined the order of St. Dominic and devoted himself to theology, distinguishing himself in this field by dividing most of Augustine's works into chapters and prefixing to each an analysis of its contents. He was provincial prior of his order in England 1261–72, archbishop of Canterbury 1272–78, and cardinal-bishop of Porto 1278–1279. He was the first mendicant advanced to a great post in the English Church. As archbishop he held frequent synods. Those of 1273 and 1277 mark important developments in the representation of the lower clergy. On leaving England in July, 1279, he took with him, along with other property of the see, all the records of Canterbury. To this day the oldest records of the see date from the time of Archbishop Peckham, Kilwardby's successor. Kilwardby was a voluminous writer, and in his day he was widely studied. Manuscripts of his *De ortu scientiarum*, his most important work, are preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, and in the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: N. Trivet, *Annales sex regum Angliae*, ed. T. Hog, London, 1845; and in the *Rolls Series: Annales Monastici*, 5 vols., London, 1864–69 (consult Index); *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I. and II.*, ed. W. Stubbs, 2 vols., ib. 1882–83; Bartholomew of Colton, *Hist. Anglicana*, ed. H. R. Luard, London, 1859. Consult: J. Quétif and J. Echard, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum*, i. 374–380, Paris, 1719; W. F. Hook, *Archbishops of Canterbury*, iii. 304–326, 12 vols., London, 1860–76; J. B. Hauréau, *Hist. de la philosophie scolastique*, II., ii. 28–33, Paris, 1880; *DNB*, xxxi. 120–122.

KIMCHI, kim′kî (ḲIMḤI): The name of a Jewish family of scholars of Spanish descent, flourishing in France in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

1. Joseph ben Isaac Kimchi, b. in southern

Spain c. 1100; d. probably in Narbonne c. 1175; migrated from Spain to Narbonne. In his grammatical studies he was influenced by Judah ben Ḥayyuj, Abul-Walid, and Abraham ibn Esra. His grammar, *Sepher zikkaron,* " Book of remembrance " (cf. Mal. iii. 16), gives for the first time the division of the Hebrew vowels into five long ones and five short ones. The *Sepher haggalui,* " Book of Open Evidence" (cf. Jer. xxxii. 14) is a criticism of the dictionary of Menahem ben Saruḳ and its defense by Jacob ben Meir. Joseph wrote also commentaries on Proverbs, Job and the Song of Songs. Codex de Rossi 166 contains excerpts from an exposition of the Pentateuch, and marginal notes in the Codex de Rossi 1070 give comments on the prophets. A commentary on the whole Bible belonged, according to the catalogue *Collectio Davidis,* p. 525, to the library of Oppenheimer. According to Zunz (*Litteraturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie,* p. 460, Berlin, 1865), Joseph wrote also six liturgical poems. From the Arabic he translated the *Mibḥar happeninim* of Solomon ibn Gabirol and a large part of the "Duties of the Heart" of Bachja ibn Pakuda. Of his *Sepher habberith,* " Book of the Covenant " (cf. Ex. xxiv. 7), a conversation between a believing Jew and an infidel, only the beginning has been preserved.

2. Moses Kimchi, the older son of Joseph, d. about 1190, has become generally known by his *Mahalakh shebile hadda'ath,* "Guide to the Paths of Science," a concise epitome of Hebrew grammar. His grammatical work *Sepher Taḥbosheth* quoted by David Kimchi seems to have been lost. Zunz (ut sup., p. 462) enumerates four liturgical poems by Moses. His exposition of Proverbs was completed 1178, that of Job 1184.

3. David Kimchi, usually called Redaḳ, the younger son of Joseph, was born at Narbonne c. 1160; d. there 1235. He often calls his father and his brother his teachers. As a grammarian and exegete David distinguishes himself by his diligent compilation of facts, sober judgment and clear expression. By making an exhaustive use of Abul-Walid, he enjoyed great authority among both Christians and Jews, although he possessed little originality. Reuchlin and Sebastian Münster made large use of his works. These have been very frequently printed, many of his commentaries with Latin translations. E. König's *Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache* (Leipsic, 1881 sqq.) was compiled " in constant dependence upon Qimchi," and even now scholars may receive many a suggestion from Kimchi's works. (H. L. STRACK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: In general: G. B. de Rossi, *Historisches Wörterbuch der jüdischen Schriftsteller,* pp. 164–171, Bautzen, 1839; Ersch and Gruber, *Encyclopädie,* II. xxxvi. 54–57; J. Winter and A. Wünsche, *Die jüdische Litteratur,* ii. 191–205, 306–314, Treves, 1894; *JE,* vii. 494–497.

On **1**: E. Bluth, in *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums,* 1891–92 passim; W. Bacher, in *Revue des études juives,* vi (1883), 208–221. On **2**; W. Bacher, ut sup., xxi (1890), 281–285. On **3**: J. Tauber, *Standpunkt und Leistung des David Kimchi als Grammatiker,* Breslau, 1867; *Encyclopædia Britannica,* xiv. 77–78.

KING, HENRY CHURCHILL: Congregationalist; b. at Hillsdale, Mich., Sept. 18, 1858. He studied at Hillsdale College, Oberlin College (B.A., 1879), Oberlin Theological Seminary (from which he was graduated in 1882), Harvard (1882–84), and Berlin (1893–94). While a student in the seminary he was tutor in Latin (1879–81) and mathematics (1881–82) in the preparatory department of his college. He returned to Oberlin in 1884 and was associate professor of mathematics there until 1890, when he was transferred to the department of philosophy, being promoted to a full professorship of the latter subject in the following year. Since 1897 he has been professor of theology in the same institution, of which he was elected sixth president in 1902. He was a member of the committee of ten appointed in 1893 by the National Education Association to report on studies in secondary schools, and has written: *Outline of Erdmann's History of Philosophy* (New York, 1892); *Appeal of the Child* (baccalaureate sermons; Oberlin, 1900); *Outline of the " Microcosms " of Hermann Lotze* (1901); *Reconstruction in Theology* (New York, 1901); *Theology and the Social Consciousness* (1902); *Personal and Ideal Elements in Education* (1904); *Rational Living: Some Practical Inferences from Modern Psychology* (1905); *Letters to Sunday School Teachers on the Great Truths of our Christian Faith* (Boston, 1906); *Seeming Unreality of the Spiritual Life* (New York, 1908); and *Laws of Friendship—Human and Divine* (1909).

KING, JOHN: Bishop of London; b. at Worminghall (8 m. e. of Oxford), Buckinghamshire, c. 1559; d. in London Mar. 30, 1621. He studied at the Westminster School and at Christ Church, Oxford (B.A., 1580; M. A., 1583; B.D., 1591; D.D., 1601) and, on taking orders, became domestic chaplain to John Piers, archbishop of York. He was made archdeacon of Nottingham 1590, rector of St. Andrew, Holborn, 1597, prebendary of St. Paul's 1599, dean of Christ Church, Oxford, 1605, prebendary of Lincoln 1610, and bishop of London 1611. He was vice-chancellor of the University of Oxford 1607–10, and was also a royal chaplain, both under Queen Elizabeth and James I., who styled him the " King of preachers." The report that on his death-bed he became reconciled to the Church of Rome is unfounded. He published several single sermons and *Lectures upon Jonas, Delivered at Yorke in . . . 1594* (Oxford, 1597), reprinted in Nichols' *Commentaries of the Puritan Period* (vol. i., London, 1864).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses,* ed. P. Bliss, ii. 294, 634, 861, iii. 839, *Fasti,* i. 248, 255, 4 vols., London, 1813–20; *DNB,* xxxi. 136–138 (where reference to scattered notices is given).

KING, JONAS: Congregational missionary; b. at Hawley, Mass., July 29, 1792; d. at Athens, Greece, May 22, 1869. He was graduated at Williams College, 1816, and at Andover Theological Seminary, 1819; entered the Congregational ministry; labored as missionary in Syria 1823–26, and in Greece from July, 1828, till his death. From 1821 till 1828 he held (nominally) the professorship of Oriental languages and literature at Amherst and spent a part of his time studying in Paris, with a view to entering upon the duties of his chair. He published several volumes of translations, and original works in modern Greek. His work in Athens was at all times disliked by the ecclesiastical authorities; and in Mar., 1852, he was convicted of teaching doctrines contrary to the religion of the Greek Church, and sentenced to fifteen days' imprisonment and to exile, with costs. A protest from the United States government prevented the execution of this sentence, and in 1854 it was revoked. King's "Miscellaneous Works" (Modern Gk., 2 vols., Athens, 1859) include documents referring to his trial.

Bibliography: Mrs. F. E. H. Haines, *Jonas King, Missionary to Syria and Greece*, New York, 1879.

KING, THOMAS STARR: Unitarian; b. in New York Dec. 16, 1824; d. in San Francisco Mar. 4, 1864. His education was interrupted by the death of his father, a Universalist clergyman then residing at Charlestown, Mass., and he was compelled to go to work in a dry-goods store. Later, while engaged in teaching, he studied theology in his spare time, and began to preach in 1845. He was pastor of the Universalist Church at Charlestown 1846–48, of the Hollis Street Unitarian Church, Boston, 1848–60, and of the Unitarian Church in San Francisco 1860–64. He was a brilliant speaker and achieved a national reputation as a lecturer. At the outbreak of the Civil War, when it seemed probable that California would secede, King threw himself into the breach and by his eloquence saved the State to the Union. During the war he was active in the interest of the United States Sanitary Commission. While located at Boston he spent much time exploring the White Mountains and published *The White Hills, their Legends, Landscape, and Poetry* (Boston, 1859). *Patriotism and other Papers* (1864), *Christianity and Humanity* (1877), *Substance and Show, and other Lectures* (1877) were published posthumously.

Bibliography: A *Memoir*, by E. P. Whipple, was prefixed to *Christianity and Humanity*, ut sup., pp. vii.–lxxx. Consult also: R. Frothingham, *A Tribute to Thomas Starr King*, Boston, 1864; O. T. Shuck, *Thomas Starr King in Verse*, privately printed, 1905.

KING, WILLIAM: Archbishop of Dublin; b. at Antrim, Ireland, May 1, 1650; d. at Dublin May 8, 1729. He studied at Trinity College, Dublin (B.A., 1670; M.A., 1673; D.D., 1689), and took orders in 1674. He became provost of the cathedral church of Tuam 1676, chancellor of St. Patrick's and rector of St. Werburgh's 1679, dean of St. Patrick's 1689, bishop of Derry 1691, and archbishop of Dublin 1703. For espousing the cause of William of Orange he was imprisoned by James II. in 1688 and again in 1690, but was liberated after the defeat of James' army at the battle of the Boyne (July 1, 1690). Though a Whig, he was an Irish patriot, and defended vigorously the interests of the Irish against the encroachments of the English. His major work is *De origine mali* (Dublin and London, 1702; Eng. transl. by Edmund Law, London, 1731), which attempts, on a Lockean basis, to reconcile the existence of evil with the goodness of God. The work attracted considerable attention, and was criticized by Bayle, Leibnitz, and others. King also published a number of sermons and *The State of the Protestants in Ireland under the Late King James' Government* (London, 1691), an important vindication of the principles of the Revolution.

Bibliography: The chief authority is J. Ware, *Archiepiscoporum Casseliensium et Tuamensium vitae*, Dublin, 1626; very valuable is *A Great Archbishop of Dublin. William King, his Autobiography, Family, and a Selection from his Correspondence*, ed. Sir Charles Simeon King, London, 1908. For other scattered references consult *DNB*, xxxi. 163–167.

KINGDOM, BROTHERHOOD OF THE: An organization having for its aim the study of the teachings of Jesus regarding the kingdom of God and the realization of these teachings in a spirit of brotherhood. There are no officers except an executive committee elected annually, with chairman, and corresponding and recording secretaries. The Brotherhood was founded in Dec., 1892. Shortly thereafter the compilation of a series of essays on the kingdom in its various relations was suggested and the work of their preparation was undertaken by a small group of men. Later, it was agreed that the writers should meet at Marlborough on the Hudson, N. Y., in the month of August, 1893, for the purpose of comparing their essays and bringing them into a full agreement and unity. The simple basis of organization, entitled *Spirit and Aims of the Brotherhood*, was then adopted, and the first executive committee was elected. Thirteen annual conferences have since been held, all but one at Marlborough, and a few smaller conferences have been held at various times between these annual conferences, in the city of New York and elsewhere. The first conference was attended by eleven men. The second being more largely attended and exciting considerable neighborhood interest, the meetings took on a more public character, so that in announcing the third conference it seemed desirable to extend a public invitation to all interested in the movement, and since that time the conferences have been entirely open to the public, with the exception of a short business session each morning, confined to the enrolled members of the Brotherhood. Reports of four of these conferences have been published, besides tracts, leaflets, and magazine articles from time to time.

While the Brotherhood has as yet attempted little beyond the holding of its annual conference and the putting forth of occasional expressions of opinion regarding current questions of a social and religious character in pamphlets and circulars, it has made preparation for a larger sphere of activity in the future in several ways. It has a standing committee on evangelization, whose aim is to promote evangelistic effort on a social basis. It has also a committee on foreign correspondence, through which it seeks to come into touch with those of similar views and aims in England, on the continent of Europe, and elsewhere. And latterly, as the need of more permanent organization and lateral extension has become manifest, provision has been made for local chapters of the Brotherhood, receiving their charters from it and pledged to its spirit and aims as their unalterable basis of constitution.

Leighton Williams.

KINGDOM OF GOD.

Jewish Views of the Kingdom (§ 1).
The Pauline Doctrine (§ 2).
The Teaching of Jesus (§ 3).
The Kingdom Previous to Augustine (§ 4).
Augustine's Doctrine of the Kingdom (§ 5).
Luther on the Kingdom (§ 6).
Luther's Earthly Kingdom of God (§ 7).
Theories of Zwingli and Calvin (§ 8).
Pietism and the Enlightenment on the Kingdom (§ 9).
Kant and Herder (§ 10).
The Theory of Schleiermacher (§ 11).
Reconciliation of Conflicting Views by Schleiermacher (§ 12).
Ritschl's Theory of the Kingdom (§ 13).
The Kingdom of God and the Church (§ 14).

In the teaching of Jesus "kingdom of God" is a phrase denoting his adherence to the expectation of salvation developed from the Israelitic belief in God as the king of the people; although in modern systematic theology it implies a body of subjects who obey a ruler, so that the highest good, in the religious and ethical sense, is regarded as a saving gift of God and as a common aim to be attained. Since, however, the Oriental kingdom is not an organic nation, but dominion over a territory, the dominant idea is not so much the rule of God over his people, as manifested in their obedience, as the realization of the future kingdom (Isa. lii. 7; Ob. 21), overcoming its present obstacles in favor of his people. From this kingdom mankind shall reap abundant blessings, though for its progress they can do nothing, since it comes only through the miraculous intervention of God, and by means of a total and sudden change of the world (Dan. ii. 44). These deviating concepts of history and of systematic theology, however, are supplementary rather than contradictory, since the realization of the kingdom of God in favor of his people presupposes that they are obedient to the divine governance, as is evident from the prophetical writings (cf. Isa. vi. sqq., x. 20 sqq., xlv. 8, lx. 21).

1. Jewish Views of the Kingdom.

The hope of the future "kingdom of God" in Jewish eschatology had various forms regarding the obstacles to God's rule, whom the kingdom concerned, the manner in which it was to be realized, and the consequences of its establishment. The obstacle to God's rule was seen at first in the oppression of God's people by neighboring nations and by the universal empires which followed each other; later in the oppression of the pious by impious factions and rulers; subsequently in the dominion of hostile spiritual powers, such as stars, avenging angels, and Satan; and finally, about the first century B.C., in the belief that the whole present world is evil and doomed. Those whom the kingdom of God concerned were originally the people of Israel; then righteous individuals, first in Israel, and later also outside the chosen people. Its realization meant primarily the restitution of the old national glory by the aid of God and the cooperation of man; but later, as conditions became worse, solely by miraculous divine intervention. Finally there was expected an entire change of all things, a new world which already exists in heaven and is brought about by the conquest of Satan, the last judgment, the resurrection of the dead, and the downfall of the old world. The gifts of the kingdom are partly temporal and partly heavenly, consisting on the one hand in the universal rule of Israel or of the pious, with peace on earth; and on the other hand in eternal life, the cessation of evil, Sabbath rest, and communion with God and the angels. Nevertheless, there was only a partial spiritualization, and the expectation of the blessings of salvation was still more or less connected with the idea of a recompense for the fulfilment of the law.

2. The Pauline Doctrine.

In the New Testament both the old elements of Judaism and the new concepts of Christianity are clearly represented by Paul. He shares with Judaism the pessimistic view of the present world which stands under the dominion of Satan (II Cor. iv. 4; cf. Gal. i. 4; Rom. viii. 20 sqq., xii. 2); and, as in Judaism, only the righteous, who fulfil the law, can inherit the future kingdom of God (Gal. v. 21; I Cor. vi. 9; I Thess. ii. 12, iii. 13; cf. I Cor. xv. 50 sqq.). With him, too, the "kingdom" is the dominion of God, who will be "all in all" (I Cor. xv. 28), and the just shall rule with him (Rom. v. 17, iv. 13). He goes beyond the Jewish conception, on the other hand, by dating the arrival of the kingdom from the coming of Jesus the Messiah, by substituting universal human moral requirements for specifically national conditions, by spiritualizing the gifts of the kingdom (Rom. xi. 17, cf. viii. 19 sqq.), and by abolishing the concepts of legalism and reward, which are replaced by ethical fulfilments (Rom. xiv. 18; Gal. vi. 7 sqq.). While these changes may still be considered as purifying and completing the Jewish idea, Paul differed essentially from Judaism by the new concept that the future world with its miraculous powers projects into the present world (Rom. viii. 24 sqq.; Phil. iii. 20), and that upon earth God grants the blessings of the kingdom to those who believe in Christ, as partaking already, in a sense, of the life of the world to come (II Cor. i. 22, v. 5, 17; I Cor. xv. 24 sqq.; Gal. i. 4; Col. i. 13). Nor does the Pauline equation of the Church and the kingdom of Christ (which represents no essential change in the concept, but only a divergent view of the initiation and the development of the consummation) denote a human society for the independent solution of ethical problems, much less a legalistically organized association, but an organism of divinely granted powers or "graces," by which God permits the Church to grow as the body of Christ (Eph. ii. 19–22, iv. 16). Paul again transcends the Jewish concept by not considering these divine powers to be ethically indifferent "graces," but by regarding the moral life of the Christians in sanctification and love as the fruit of the supranatural and supramundane power of the Spirit (Gal. v. 22 sqq.), and by valuing the other "graces" according to their usefulness for the moral upbuilding of the Church (I Cor. xiv. 5).

In consequence of this projection of the future kingdom of God with its powers into the present world, the fundamental ethical and religious ideas of the kingdom as, on the one hand, an obedient people ruled by God, and, on the other, as the totality of gifts which God's rule vouchsafes to its members, approach each other much more closely than in the Jewish scheme. The exercise of the "graces," by which the kingdom of God or Christ is extended, becomes an ethical task for the Christian, however much before and after the efforts of his will he may be filled with the consciousness of his dependence on the working of divine grace (Rom. xii. 6–8; I Cor. xii. 14 sqq.); so that Paul calls his missionary associates "fellow workers unto the kingdom of God" (Col. iv. 11).

The Apocalypse, in like manner, recognizes not only a future kingdom of God (xix.–xxi.), but also one that is active in this present world. The believers are already rulers (i. 6, v. 10), though the special blessings of the divine kingdom are promises and there is no organic connection between obedience and promise. On the other hand, the Gospel and Epistles of John set forth the same concept as that of Paul, except for the individualism and spiritualism of Hellenistic terminology, as exemplified in the substitution of eternal life for the kingdom (except in John iii. 3, 5, xviii. 36 sqq.). While, however, Paul makes the arrival of the kingdom in this world dependent upon the elevation of Jesus to the right hand of God, for John the kingdom comes immediately through the knowledge of God (xvii. 3, xviii. 37, xiv. 9).

3. The Teaching of Jesus.

In distinction from Paul and John, the preaching of Jesus follows the Jewish scheme, in that he urges the will of man to the acquisition of moral justice by pointing to the future kingdom, since God will reward such an attitude alone with a share in his kingdom (Matt. v. 1–12, vi. 2, 33, vii. 21, xviii. 3, 8 sqq., xix. 21, 27–29, xxv. 34; Luke xii. 35–48). By the kingdom Jesus understood the establishment of the rule of God in the immediate future, with a general resurrection and judgment by a miracle of God, accompanied with a renovation of the world denoting for the just the enjoyment of an abundance of blessings, such as participation in the divine governance (Matt. xix. 28), a share in the Messianic meal with the patriarchs (Matt. viii. 11, xxvi. 29), and the sight of God, whose children they become, being equal to the angels (Matt. v. 6, 8, 9; Luke xx. 36). From Jewish hopes he drew the political and national factor and the portrayal of physical pleasures, but he did not use the term "kingdom of God" to signify the obedient subjects of God, or an organized community of such subjects. Whether the view of Paul and John concerning the projection of the future kingdom of God into this world was foreign to the spirit of Jesus depends on the question whether the justice demanded by him as a condition for a share in God's kingdom was of the same high quality as the gifts of the kingdom; whether he considered those gifts as an organic completion of justice or as a reward which stood only in a mechanical relation to it; and whether his preaching was merely mandatory, or possessed a creating and saving power, so that voluntary obedience to it could at once be felt to be the reception of miraculous, morally saving, and beatifying powers of God. As to the first point, we know that Jesus abolished the heteronomy of the legalistic attitude, and consequently the basis of a mechanical concept of a future reward, by laying all stress upon the disposition of the heart (Mark vii. 15; Matt. vii. 16–17), by substituting for the legalistic relation the relation of children to a father (Mark x. 14 sqq.), by denying any legal claims to reward (Matt. xx. 1 sqq.; Luke xvii. 7–10), by making God himself the model (Matt. v. 48), and by promising the kingdom of God to those who long for righteousness (Matt. v. 6). At the same time, Jesus subordinated temporal rewards to the spiritual blessings of the kingdom, so that with him there is an organic relation between the moral condition in this world and the blessings of the world to come. Jesus himself knew that sonship with God was a blessed thing (Matt. xi. 27), and he admonished others to feel themselves to be the children of God (Matt. x. 29–32; Luke x. 19). He promised rest to all who should take his yoke upon them (Matt. xi. 28–30), and he urged his hearers to trust boldly in God with the full assurance that their prayers were heard (Mark xi. 22 sqq.; Matt. vii. 7), and to live in purity of heart and in love even of their enemies. It is thus clear that, despite divergencies in terminology and concept, the teachings of John and Paul on the kingdom of God were in harmony with the preaching of Jesus. It is plain from Matt. xii. 28 and Luke x. 18–20 that Jesus held that the kingdom of God had already come in its religious, though not in its ethical, concept; and in like manner the comparison of John the Baptist to the least in the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xi. 11; cf. Luke xvi. 16) implies that with him the time of prophecy had ended and that of fulfilment begun. Such parables as those of the grain of mustard seed, the leaven, and the tares also teach that the kingdom had already begun, and foreshadow the progress of revelation and of the divine power entered into the world; while the victories over the powers of evil and the divine success of his preaching of the kingdom also confirmed his belief.

4. The Kingdom Previous to Augustine.

In later primitive Christianity the kingdom of God was an exclusively eschatological concept, so that, according to Hegesippus, kinsfolk of Jesus declared to Domitian that "the kingdom of Christ is not cosmic or earthly, but heavenly and angelic at the consummation of the age" (cf. also I Clem. xlii. 3; Hermas, *Similitudes*, x. 12, 8). The Church is distinguished from the kingdom of God; she will be gathered from the four corners of the earth into the kingdom which God has prepared for her (*Didache*, ix. 4, x. 5). For Tertullian, Cyprian, Justin, and Irenaeus the characteristic feature of the coming of the kingdom is the rule of God, by which they understood the discontinuance of their state of servitude and oppression, and the enjoyment of a wonderfully increased fertility of the earth. On the other hand, Lactantius (*Divinae institutiones*, VII., xxiv. 4) held that the righteous would reign with God and Christ on earth, the wicked being not entirely destroyed, but doomed to perpetual bondage and the objects of the victory of God and the triumph of the just. Irenaeus (*Haer.*, v. 32 sqq.), in opposition to the Gnostic allegorical interpretation of the New Testament, understood the cosmic Sabbath of the millennium (cf. Heb. iv.), and the heavenly feast (Matt. viii. 11) as the expectation of the kingdom, that the just might rightly enjoy the reward of their patience where they had suffered oppression. Among the Greek Fathers it was Origen who, under the influence of the Greek ideal of the dominion of reason over the passions, originated an ethical and individualistic concept of the kingdom of God based on Luke xvii. 21; Rom. xiv. 17, vi. 12; I Cor. xv. 28, but so modified that the gift of God and of his saving blessings transcends ethical duty, and the spiritual state of the Christian is considered the beginning of heavenly perfection. He understands the second petition of the Lord's Prayer expressly after the analogy of the rule of a king over his subjects in a well-ordered city, so that the soul must submit to the governance of God and obey his spiritual laws. The perfection of the kingdom of God, so that God will be all in all, takes place in every individual when Christ has conquered the enemies in him, and he progresses unceasingly until knowledge, wisdom, and other virtues come to perfection in him. The same thoughts are found in Cyril of Jerusalem ("Mystagogical Lectures," v. 13) and Gregory of Nyssa (*De oratione*, ii.), while Chrysostom, influenced by the Stoic idea of the wise man as king, develops the thought that with the coming of the kingdom the soul itself will become a king, thus coming into harmony with the New-Testament test of the kingdom of God that we shall acquire dominion in it (*De oratione dominica hom.*). Ephraem (*Cohortatio ad pœnitentiam*, xxiv., cf. ix., x.), like Johannes Cassianus (*Cohortatio*, i. 13), following Origen, laid stronger stress on the mystic indwelling of God.

5. Augustine's Doctrine of the Kingdom.

Augustine unites in the concept of the kingdom of God the two characteristics of "being ruled by God" and of "reigning with God," the latter, which begins after the resurrection, being the decisive indication. The saints or the just themselves constitute the kingdom of God, since their hearts are governed inwardly by Christ or God (*MPL*, xxxix. 830, 832); but the kingdom, strictly speaking, is still in the future (*MPL*, xxxiv. 1814, xxxvi. 388), and he declared it madness to connect temporal life with the kingdom of heaven. With Augustine the future "reigning with God" had no analogy with a rule to be exercised over others or with an influence upon others, but consisted wholly of the contemplation and enjoyment of God. Nevertheless, Augustine gave up his former expectation of the millennium and referred the promises of Rev. xx. to the present (*De civitate Dei*, xx. 9), so that the reign of the saints with Christ promised for the millennium must exist in the present, though with a power far inferior to that of the future. The kingdom consequently implies for him, as for Barnabas before him, Sabbath rest (ed. *MPL*, xxxvi. 1198). However personal this conception of the kingdom in which God rules may be, Augustine regarded it from the very first as a community, a phase in the battle which is waged in the course of the world between the "kingdom of heaven" and the "kingdom of earth" or "of the devil." On the other hand, he also identified the empirical church, which includes sinners, with the kingdom of God (*MPL*, xxxvi. 409, xxxvii. 672 sqq.). This organization is for him an instrument of the rule of God, and the activity of its ministers is useful to the kingdom, even if their personal conduct is evil (*MPL*, xxxvi. 1169). It was not strange, therefore, that scholasticism should make Augustine's ethical "Church of conflict" the "Church militant," and in like manner he influenced the course of medieval development by his idea that the secular state should submit to the guidance of the Church, which embodies true justice for the community. Alongside the concept of the kingdom of God as relating to organized society, there developed after Augustine the idea of the kingdom in relation to the individual. St. Bernard, like the Greek Fathers (cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Catena aurea*, on Matt. vi. and Luke xi.) and Augustine, distinguished, on the basis of Luke xvii. 21, between a free submission of man's will to the will of God in the present world, and the future reign with Christ. Bonaventura (*Stimulus amoris*, iii. 17) regards devotion to God and the experience of salvation as the highest good, which is the indwelling of God; while according to Tauler (*Predigten*, Frankfort, 1703, 774, 926, 1202, 1206), the kingdom of God is God himself, dwelling in the soul in his own nature and essence, with all his heavenly gifts and treasures.

6. Luther on the Kingdom.

Luther follows, on the whole, the thoughts of Augustine, though with important modifications. He treats the kingdom of God from the standpoint of the law and the Gospel, the law expressing the eternal destiny of man, which is realized by the Gospel, so that life according to the law is life in the kingdom of God. In this connection he also uses the analogy of a commanding king and an obedient people. The life of voluntary submission to the will of God is at the same time the blessed life, so that "blessedness means that God rules in us, and we are his kingdom" (*Werke*, Erlangen ed., xxi. 184). Thus the kingdom of God as the ethical rule of God is for him the highest good in the ethical as well as in the religious sense. Man is under the dominion of sin, but the Gospel comes as a message of redemption through Christ, whereby the law is fulfilled, or the rule of God is realized according to its two factors, beginning in the present and completed in the future. Upon earth this is called the kingdom of Christ, but for Luther there is no real difference between the kingdom of Christ and that of God. Owing to Luther's concept of redemption, he differs from Augustine in regard to the realization of the kingdom of God. While both regard the kingdom as voluntary devotion untrammeled by the law, and as a miraculous gift of the spirit of God, Luther derives the effect of this change, which still takes place through the miraculous powers of God, psychologically from the individual assurance of forgiveness through Christ. Moreover, in consequence of his doctrine that, more than all human actions, faith resting upon the pledge of forgiveness in Christ is the certainty of salvation, the faith of the Christian means for Luther experience of salvation in a way quite different from that of Augustine, and thus for him the future "reigning with God" coincides with the present "rule by God" both in time and in content. Luther extends the thought of the royal dominion of the believers over all creatures and over heaven and earth, in the sense that the assurance of the fatherhood of God includes the assurance that all things work together for good, i.e., for eternal life. Thus by his concept of the kingdom, which is a share in the dominion of God or Christ over all, he avoids the disregard of the good and evil of this world which had been taught by Augustine and, at first, by himself.

7. Luther's Earthly Kingdom of God.

As the kingdom of God consists of the Christians over whom and in favor of whom God or Christ rules, and who rule with him, it was but natural for Luther to regard the kingdom on earth as in an extensive and intensive state of growth, so that it is the duty of every Christian to increase the number of the faithful or to build up God's kingdom (Erlangen ed., viii. 241, xii. 319, xxxiii. 344, xxxix. 14, l. 153, 235). But Luther did not go far enough to regard the kingdom of God as the highest ethical good or as an all-comprehending ethical end. This was because, in the first place, his ethics was not teleological but experiential, and in the second place because he did not subordinate the spheres of the economic and political states which, together with the Church, make up his ideal of life on earth, to a common and eternal purpose. The secular spheres and their various vocations have for him only earthly aims, and their works are governed by natural law. He did not think of the possibility and necessity of elevating earthly callings to a higher sphere of morality by means of Christianity; yet he did not contradict the view of Melanchthon, who saw in the good works of Christians in their secular callings a "policy of Christ to show his kingdom before the world." For Luther, as for others, the realization of the kingdom of Christ was the Church, which, however, he held to be the congregation of believers whom Christ rules through the Word and the Spirit. On the other hand, he recognized the kingdom of God wherever faith and love were manifest in earthly callings, and he held the Church to be the kingdom only where her activity truly proceeded from faith and love (Erlangen ed., xxiii. 385).

8. Theories of Zwingli and Calvin.

With Zwingli the ethical conception of the kingdom of God preponderated. For him it is contained, in the first place, in preaching, i.e., in the offering of heavenly blessings and of the grace vouchsafed in Christ, and, in the second place, in the Church, to which preaching calls. Where the Gospel is received, there is established the kingdom of God, which consists of faith, piety, justice, and innocence, so that it coincides with those who are regenerated through Christ (*Opera*, ed. H. Schuler and J. Schulthess, Zurich, 1828–42, vi. 210, 236, 239, 289, 302, 352, 390, 609, 693); and he emphasizes the view that the "people of God" are characterized simply and solely by their striving to have the kingdom of God within them. With Calvin the fundamental characteristic of the kingdom was the rule of God, in the sense of the subordination of man to the divine will (*Commentarii in N. T.*, ed. A. Tholuck, Berlin, 1833–34, i. 167). It is not in the future, but begins in faith upon earth through the Word and the secret working of the Holy Spirit (ib., i. 167, iii. 44, 336). It is, therefore, a product of divine as well as human activity; nor did it first come with Christ, whose office it was "to spread through all the world the kingdom of God, which was then restricted to a corner of Judæa" (ib., i. 287). The future kingdom is thus the completion of the one begun on earth, and is characterized by continued progress (ib., i. 167; *CR*, xxx. 667). Unlike Luther, Calvin sought to bring the kingdom of God to expression in the external forms of life. The realization of the rule of God is, in the eyes of Calvin also, the Church, and the communion of saints is the test of the empirical church (ed. A. Tholuck, i. 146, 262, ii. 198; *CR*, xxx. 757). He again differed from Luther in so far as he was inclined to regard the constitution of the New Testament as an eternal law given by God, and to regard church discipline as an order instituted by God for the conservation of the spiritual state (*CR*, 776 sqq., 867 sqq., 891 sqq.); while he carefully distinguished political from ecclesiastical dominion (*CR*, xxv. 1092 sqq.).

9. Pietism and the Enlightenment on the Kingdom.

In Pietism (q.v.) the longing for the betterment of religious conditions led to a distinction between the kingdom of God and the official Church or Christian morality. Spener advocated the expectation of better times for the Church, interpreting this as a preparatory triumph of the glorious kingdom of Christ; a time of the expansion and awakening of the Church, which was to begin with the destruction of Babylon (the Roman Catholic Church); and the conversion of the Jews. The younger generation of Pietists, like J. J. Moser, dated the beginning of the kingdom from the movement of Spener, thinking of the contrast between traditional and genuine Christianity. Emancipation from dogmatics, a deeper study of the Bible, and its historical interpretation led to the tenet that the Scriptures contain the records of a history of revelation and religion passing through a series of developments comprised under the general term "kingdom of God," a theory represented especially by Bengel, C. A. Crusius, and Johann Jakob Hess. The period of the Enlightenment (q.v.) emphasized primarily the active ethical side in the kingdom of God and its analogy with a community of obedient subjects, but did not overlook the religious side, since it was only through God's government of the world that the harmony between the sphere of morality and that of nature was accomplished, or that the comprehensive union of humanity was effected which was necessary for the realization of the moral idea. Owing to the indelible goodness of the heart, it was held that there is no sharp distinction between the history of natural humanity and the history of salvation, so that the kingdom of God progresses even outside Judaism and Christianity. Leibnitz interpreted the "kingdom of grace" as the dominion of God in the spirit-world, while Semler understood it as the new spiritual reign of God in the Church, and Reinhard conceived it as an ethical brotherhood established by Jesus to include all peoples.

10. Kant and Herder.

Kant, on the other hand, made morality entirely independent, even regeneration being an act of the individual. Morality leads, however, to a religious faith of reason in so far as the duty is felt to aim at a highest good. The power of morality is insufficient to realize this; and it must, therefore, postulate a moral ruler of the world, since a society must be established according to the laws of virtue for the protection of the individual against the evil principle which surrounds him. This ethical community, which can be realized only as a people of God under laws of virtue, Kant calls the kingdom of God on earth, and uses its idea as a test for the criticism and purification of the empirical Church. Herder considered the kingdom of God to be the development of humanity as it proceeds under the laws of nature or of the goodness, power, and wisdom of God, who furnishes the means and endowments; and he was the first consciously to combine the ethical and religious sense of Christianity with the Greek universal and free development of the entire personality.

11. The Theory of Schleiermacher.

The founder of the specific use of the concept of the kingdom of God in modern theology was Schleiermacher. The idea of the kingdom of God forms the basis of his teaching, governing his system both of doctrine and of ethics. The kingdom of God is the purpose and realization of redemption; and it is not only the highest purpose of action, but also the highest blessing (*Christliche Sitte*, Berlin, 1843, p. 78). He conceives the kingdom of God after the analogy of the relation between a ruling king and his obedient subjects, yet so that the king's will is the will of all who serve and live under him. The manner in which the rule of God (or the being of God) is exercised in man is consciousness of God, which is real only as motivating activity or, more specifically (since God is the supreme all-embracing unity), as the love of all mankind (*Glaubenslehre*, Berlin, 1821–22, §§ 90, 94). This consciousness of God raises man above the world, and through it is realized the further progress of the kingdom of God throughout the earth. Unlike Kant, Schleiermacher not only conceived moral activity as immediately religious, as having its motive in the consciousness of God; but he was also able to understand human activity as the working of the Divine, in virtue of his ethical fundamental concept of the highest good. By this he understood such a result of moral activity as both included this activity within itself and propagated it. Nevertheless, Schleiermacher's restriction of the blessedness arising from the consciousness of God to those filled with the love of all mankind was, at least in terminology, an ethical narrowing of the concept of the immanent kingdom of God. For Schleiermacher the realization of the kingdom of God was the work of Christ, in so far as he, through the strength and bliss of his consciousness of God, exercised a creative power of attraction which originated a common life ruled by the same impulse of divine consciousness; since before Christ there had never been so great a power of pure consciousness of God, and hence no society comprising all mankind.

12. Reconciliation of Conflicting Views by Schleiermacher.

In endeavoring to harmonize Christian tradition with the point of view of historical development, Schleiermacher saw, on the one hand, a course of evolution, first realized in Christ, and, on the other hand, he looked upon conditions before Christ as a universal life of sin, i.e., an impediment of human nature contrary to its destiny, and upon the work of Christ in founding the universal life of the kingdom of God as redemption. For both points of view he presupposed the original, or indelible, perfection of man and the world. He thus shared the view of primitive Christianity, regarding a kingdom of evil opposed to the kingdom of God, even though he rejected the rule of a personal devil, and replaced the Pauline view of "the flesh" and Augustine's doctrine of original sin by that of universal sin; but he contradicted himself by considering sin a necessary step in development. The kingdom of God becomes real through redemption from sin and evil. The consciousness of God, given by Christ to the believer, is pure and blessed will directed toward the kingdom of God; but this continual impulse toward the kingdom of God becomes real in the individual only in so far as the spirit of the universal life founded by Christ becomes his own impulse (*Glaubenslehre*, § 121). This universal life of the kingdom of God coincided for Schleiermacher with his concept of the Church, since for him the existence of the Church was a matter of faith in Christ, who alone can be sure that in a world of sin and evil the empirical Church is a place of goodness and salvation. His position here is similar to that of Luther in so far as he too held that the kingdom of God can not be tested by the legal organization of the Church and does not coincide with the empirical Church. While there is a wide divergence between the concept, both in primitive Christianity and later, that the immanent kingdom of God comes to pass through the miraculous power of the Spirit proceeding from the exalted Christ, and Schleiermacher's view that the personal life of Christ on earth became the motivating power of the universal spirit of the universal life, this divergence is based merely on a changed psychology. On the other hand, there is an essential limitation of Christian hope when it is reduced to an expectation of infinite organic progress, with a rejection of the eternal perfection of the individual and the mass. Schleiermacher marked, however, an important development not only in the doctrine of faith, but also in the doctrine of ethics, since the doctrine of faith developed for him into the ethical impulse to do all that is in our power for the realization of the kingdom of God, while in the religious satisfaction granted by God is found a sufficient motive for morality. At the same time it becomes possible to harmonize the divergent incentives to morality presented in the New Testament, and to blend in the concept of a single moral highest good the two previous varieties of Christian ethics, the theory of duty and the theory of virtue. It likewise obviates the danger of quietism in case there is no end to stimulate the will, and, finally, it affords a basis of uniting early Christian and pre-Christian ethics.

13. Ritschl's Theory of the Kingdom.

Ritschl followed Schleiermacher, but deepened his thoughts by a closer approach to the New Testament and to Luther. He took his stand in the historical life of the body of believers, which is assured that it is established through the revelation of the free grace of God in Christ which brings forgiveness of sins. Like Schleiermacher, he united the recognition of a moral development which culminates in Christ with the concept of sin, but to him sin was more than imperfect development, it was the contradiction of good, and its judgment as our own action and guilt was not phenomenological, as it was with Schleiermacher, but inherent, and according to the judgment of God. The spiritual movement of believers proceeds in two directions, in the specifically religious function of the consciousness of reconciliation with God, and in the moral function of activity for the kingdom of God. This kingdom Ritschl understood after the analogy of a people that heartily obeys its ruler; the will of God, however, he regarded not as a sum of norms, but as a uniform purpose. For both Schleiermacher and Ritschl, the kingdom of God is the highest good, not only as a problem to be solved progressively by the activity of all mankind, but also as a religious good, as a gift and work of God, and as something that makes life and blessedness. Although Ritschl was rightly led by Kaftan to emphasize not only the divinely fixed purpose of the kingdom of God, but also the divine blessings to be enjoyed, he justly refused to speak with Kaftan of two sides of the kingdom of God, of an ethical side by which man faces the world, and a mystical side by which he retires from the world; for not only does the supermundane kingdom of God in the New Testament include the ethical side, but Kaftan's idea leads to quietism.

14. The Kingdom of God and the Church.

The ethical results of Schleiermacher's concept of the kingdom of God were fully accepted by Ritschl, and he was thus enabled to obviate a dualism between the moral requirements of holiness and justice on the one hand, and love on the other, by recognizing love, as directed toward the ends of the kingdom of God, to be itself the moral will. He likewise removed Luther's and Schleiermacher's lack of clearness in defining the relation of the kingdom of God to the Church by distinguishing between the religious, ethical, and legal concepts of the Church. In so far as both are regarded as the working of God, the Church and the kingdom of God coincide; they are both the sum total of persons who have been transposed by the Gospel of Christ into the life of an ethically active faith, independently of any legal organization. The Church has the special duty of worship, acknowledgment, and education; the kingdom of God that of the organization of humanity through love. The legal organization of the Church is only a means for the solution of her ethical problems. If systematic theology retains the concept of the kingdom of God, it must always be in objective continuity not only with theology since Origen, but also with primitive Christianity although its formulas must be amended by modern historical knowledge. (J. Gottschick†.)

Bibliography: A review of the subject is given in J. Weiss, *Die Idee des Reiches Gottes in der Theologie*, Giessen, 1901. Much of the literature under Messiah; Parables; and Biblical Theology treats the subject (especially the discussions by Weiss, Holtzmann, and Beyschlag) as do many of the treatises on the life of Christ. Consult further: Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. 496–556, Eng. transl., II., ii. 126 sqq.; F. Theremin, *Lehre vom göttlichen Reich*, Berlin, 1823; K. Wittichen, *Die Idee des Reiches Gottes*, Göttingen, 1872; J. S. Candlish, *The Kingdom of God Biblically and Historically Considered*, Edinburgh, 1884; G. Wilson, *The Kingdom of God . . . According to the Inspired Records*, Bloomington, Ill., 1888; A. B. Bruce, *The Kingdom of God; or Christ's Teachings according to the Synoptical Gospels*, Edinburgh, 1889; E. Issel, *Die Lehre vom Reich Gottes*, Leyden, 1891; O. Schmoller, *Die Lehre vom Reich Gottes*, ib. 1891; E. Haupt, in *TSK*, lxv (1892); Hering, in *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1892; O. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, new ed., Tübingen, 1906; G. Schnedermann, *Jesu Verkündigung und Lehre vom Reich Gottes*, 2 parts, Leipsic, 1893–95; H. Holland, *God's City and the Coming of the Kingdom*, London, 1894; L. Tolstoi, *The Kingdom of God is within you*, New York, 1894, and often; L. Paul, *Die Vorstellungen vom Messias und vom Gottesreich bei den Synoptikern*, Bonn, 1895; A. Titius, *Jesu Lehre vom Reiche Gottes*, Freiburg, 1895; R. Belaney, *Kingdom of God on Earth*, London, 1896; Klöpper, in *ZWT*, 1897; F. Krop, *La Pensée de Jésus sur le royaume de Dieu*, Paris, 1897; J. Schäfer, *Das Reich Gottes im Licht der Parabeln*, Mainz, 1897; R. Wegener, *Ritschls Idee des Reiches Gottes*, Leipsic, 1897; G. Dalmann, *Die Worte Jesu*, pp. 75–113, Leipsic, 1898; A. Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, vol. ii., Freiburg, 1899; W. Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, Strasburg, 1900; J. Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reich Gottes*, Göttingen, 1900; W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judenthums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, pp. 199–276, Berlin, 1903; P. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba*, §§ 27, 42–48, Tübingen, 1903; P. Wernle, *Die Reichgotteshoffnung in den ältesten christlichen Dokumenten und bei Jesus*, ib. 1903; W. Bousset, *Jesus*, pp. 71–98, New York, 1906; J. Böhmer, *Der religionsgeschichtliche Rahmen des Reiches Gottes*, Leipsic, 1909.

KINGO, THOMAS HANSEN: Danish bishop and hymn-writer; b. at Slangerup (15 m. n.n.w. of Copenhagen) 1634; d. at Odense, island of Fünen, Oct. 14, 1703. He studied at the University of Copenhagen, being graduated in 1654, and for some time acted as tutor in private families. In 1661 he was appointed vicar to the pastor at Kirke Helsinge (50 m. s.w. of Copenhagen), and in 1668 he was ordained minister at his native town, where his poetic activity began. At first he essayed patriotic poems, but later devoted himself almost entirely to the writing of hymns, and in 1674 the first part of his *Aandelige Sjunge Chor* (" Spiritual Song Choir ") appeared; followed in 1681 by part ii. This work consists of a collection of beautiful hymns several of which are still popular in the Danish Church. In 1677 Kingo was appointed bishop of Zealand. Charged by the government with the compilation of a new hymn-book, he edited (1699) the so-called *Kingo's Psalmebog* which contains eighty-five of his own compositions, and which is still used in various parts of Denmark and Norway. Kingo was especially renowned for his beautiful Easter hymns, in one of which he symbolizes the resurrection of Jesus by the "golden sun which breaks through the dark clouds." He was influential also in causing light and tuneful melodies to be adapted to the requirements of the Church.

(F. Nielsen†.)

Bibliography: There is a biography by R. Petersen, Copenhagen, 1887.

KINGS, BOOKS OF.

Contents and View-point (§ 1)
Date and Sources (§ 2.)
Historicity and Chronology (§ 3).
The Text (§ 4).

1. Contents and View-point.

The two books which follow Samuel and precede Chronicles in the English version were originally one book, but were divided in the Septuagint and the Vulgate; in Daniel Bomberg's Hebrew Bible the division was adopted for the Hebrew. The books divide into three parts. I Kings i.–xi. contains the account of David's death with Solomon's accession and the story of his reign, including the account of the building of the temple and of the internal and external policies inaugurated by him; I Kings xii.–II Kings xvii. contains the synchronistic account of the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel to the fall of the latter; II Kings xviii.–xxv. continues the history of the southern kingdom to the Babylonian exile. The first two chapters of I Kings belong rather to the preceding narrative beginning with II Sam. ix. and giving the story of David's reign, and chap. iii. begins a narrative different from that which precedes. The form is neither that of a chronicle of external events nor a political history, but rather an account based on a religious conception of the relation of the people to Yahweh and the connection between its unfaithfulness and the destruction which befell both kingdoms (II Kings xvii. 7 sqq.). That the promise to the house of David (I Kings xi. 32, 36, 39) was not to fail appears to have been confirmed in the view of the author by the fact that Jehoiachin in his exile was restored to honor, this being a pledge that God would keep his promise to his people. The keynote is struck in the mention of Solomon's cult of the high places and the relation of each king of Judah to this cult is specifically noted, while throughout runs the relation of the people to prophetic teachings, this last especially characteristic of these books. The point of view of the editor of the sources from which the book was compiled is unmistakably that of the Deuteronomist and preexilic prophecy; viz., that the cause of the destruction of the kingdoms was the ever-renewed cult of the high places and the idolatry connected with it. Yet it is not to be maintained, with Wellhausen, that the priestly view is excluded and that there is no knowledge shown of the distinction between Levites and priests or of the Mosaic tabernacle (I King vii. 4), and that consequently the chronicler's representation is to be set aside. Similarly the assertion that the Aaronic line of priests has no mention either overlooks the Zadokite succession which came in with the supersession of Abiathar (I Kings ii.–26–27) and continued in the Zadok-Eleazar line till the exile, or attempts to nullify it by regarding that line as not Aaronic on the ground that I Sam. ii. 27 sqq. (asserted to be a prophecy after the event) predicted the extinction of the Aaronic line; but this prophecy affected only the house of Eli and not the entire priesthood (cf. II Sam. xv. 24 for the Zadokite-Levite conception). The distinction between priest and Levite as made in Deut. xviii. 3, 6, is certainly preexilic.

2. Date and Sources.

The terminus a quo for the final redaction of the book is set by the mention of the restoration of Jehoiachin to honor (II Kings xxv. 27sqq.) in 561 B.C. But the original author must have worked before the exile about 600 B.C. under Jehoiakim, who is the latest king in connection with whom occurs the usual Deuteronomic formula closing the account of a reign. A second editing is seen in the passage II Kings xvii. 19–21, still before the exile of Judah. From this second hand proceeded the synchronistic data given for the two kingdoms,—materials not found in the sources employed by the first editors. Reference to these sources is very characteristic of the whole work. Thus there is note of the book of the acts of Solomon (I., xi. 41), fourteen references to the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah, and seventeen to the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Israel. These have been supposed to be the official records of the respective kingdoms, but the frequent changes of dynasty in the northern kingdom make this supposition untenable. They must rather have been works which indeed employed official documents and sources but were freer handling of the materials than were official records. From such sources were obtained the statistical data such as the age of the king at accession, the length of his reign and the political situation. It is also debatable whether the editor had in mind two works as sources (for Israel and for Judah) or one in two parts. Besides these sources others were employed, such as a prophetic-historical narrative like that from which the Elijah-Elisha portion is taken: also the piece II, xviii. 13–xx. 19, repeated in Isa. xxxvi.–xxxix., in which xviii. 14–16 is from a still different source (as is shown by the spelling of the name Hezekiah). This duplicated passage is probably original neither with Kings nor Isaiah. Similarly II., xxiv. 18–xxv. 30 is paralleled by Jer. lii. but is not original with Jeremiah. The Septuagint refers in I., viii. 53 to a "book of the ode," possibly the book of Jasher (Josh. x. 13), the word "ode" coming in through a misreading by transposition of letters (*shyr* instead of *yshr*).

3. Historicity and Chronology.

So far as the political relations are concerned, the historicity of these books is recognized. The especial point of attack in this matter has been the Elijah-Elisha narratives, so rich in miracles paralleled only in the events ascribed to the times of Moses and Joshua. But it is to be noted that the marvels at the Carmel sacrifice, as in the desert at the giving of the law through Moses, and again in Elijah's removal from earthly life without passing the gates of death, are no more extraordinary than the work he was called to perform, midway between Moses and Christ, in winning a victory for the worship of Yahweh. The circumstances of the northern kingdom at the time were such as to correspond with the atmosphere of miracle in which this prophet lived. Difficulties are found also in the chronology of the books. The regnal periods of the kings are given in full years, a result of a round rather than an exact reckoning. The Talmud suggests that the reckoning was from Nisan to Nisan, after a method which appears in the New Testament in the account of the resurrection, which equates the parts of three days with three full days, and in Josephus. This method of reckoning appears definitely in II Kings xviii. 9–10, where the siege of Samaria is given as lasting three years, though beginning in the seventh and ending in the ninth year of Hoshea. Similarly, while David's reign in Hebron is given in II Sam. v. 4–5 as seven and a half years, in I Kings ii. 11 it is given as seven years. Other cases of disregard of portions of a year might be given, but not in a uniform and consistent manner, the consequence being that an exact chronology can not be obtained from these books. The totals are vitally affected, as when the reigns of the kings of Judah from Solomon to the destruction foot up to 260 years and of the kings of Israel to 241 years. A recognized means of correction is found in the Assyrian annals, and of the attempts to use this means especially noteworthy is that of Kamphausen, who requires only six changes in the data of Israelitic succession to reconcile the differences in Assyrian and Israelitic chronology. See Time, Biblical Reckoning of.

4. The Text.

The original text of the Biblical authors is no longer extant; the Masoretic text does not exactly reproduce this, nor does it agree with that which formed the base of the early versions. If reference is made to the extreme care exercised by the Masoretes in regard to the text they received, it must also be recalled that this care was not exercised in the earliest times, as is proved by the widely different texts sometimes found in parallel passages. Thus in the parallels II Kings xviii. 13–xx. 19 and Isa. xxxvi.–xxxix. the Isaiah passage affords fifteen examples of the *scriptio plena*, that in Kings only three, as opposed to corresponding *scriptio defectiva* in the other. Other changes are due to glosses and marginal notes which copyists have received into the text. The testimony of the manuscripts of the Septuagint testify to changes in the Hebrew; thus the Alexandrine codex is nearer to the Masoretic text than is the Vatican, yet the intent of the translators to be faithful is manifest in that they reproduced in Greek letters Hebrew words which they no longer understood. Moreover, that the Greek translators had access to some of the sources of the Hebrew is shown by additions not found in the present Hebrew text. Care must be exercised, however, not to overestimate the value of the Septuagint for textual criticism, since the differences between extant representatives of this text differ so widely. Of the fragments preserved in the Hexapla of Origen the version of Aquila is a close reproduction of the Palestinian text, that of Symmachus is clear and elegant, that of Theodotion partakes of the character of a recension of the Septuagint on the basis of a text approximating the Masoretic. The Targum of the prophets affords little textual help, partaking as it does of the paraphrastic rather than of the literal and containing additions to the text. Where it can be used, however, it is the earliest witness to the Palestinian text on its mother soil. The Vulgate of Jerome has also considerable value since it testifies to the text of the end of the fourth Christian century.

(W. Volck†.)

Bibliography: The leading commentaries are: O. Thenius, Leipsic, 1873; K. C. W. F. Bähr, in Lange, Eng. transl., New York, 1874; G. Rawlinson, in *Bible Commentary*, London, 1874; C. F. Keil, Leipsic, 1876, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1877; G. Hammond and G. Rawlinson, in *Pulpit Commentary*, 2 vols., London, 1881–89; A. Klostermann, Munich, 1887; J. R. Lumby, in *Cambridge Bible*, Cambridge, 1888; F. W. Farrar, in *Expositor's Bible*, 2 vols., London, 1893–94; R. Kittel, Göttingen, 1900; W. E. Barnes, in *Cambridge Bible*, 1908. Special topics are treated in: A. Clemen, *Die Wunderberichte über Elia und Elisa*, Grimma, 1877; J. Meinhold, *Die Jesaiererzählungen xxxvi–xxxix*, Göttingen, 1897. On text-criticism, B. Stade, in *ZATW*, iii.–vi (1883–86), passim; A. Morgenstern, *Die Scholien des Gregorius Abulfarag . . . zum Buch der Könige*, Berlin, 1895; J. Berlinger, *Die Peschitta zum I. Buch der Könige*, Berlin, 1897; F. C. Burkitt, *Fragments of the Book of Kings according to . . . Aquila*, Cambridge, 1897; C. F. Kent, *Student's Old Testament*, vol. ii., New York, 1905 (valuable); W. D. Crockett, *A Harmony of the Books of Samuel, Kings . . . in the Text of the Version of 1884*, London, 1906. Consult also the principal works on Old Testament Introduction under Biblical Introduction, and for chronology the works cited under Era; Time, Biblical Reckoning of.

Hebrew Ideals of Kingship.

KINGSHIP IN ISRAEL: The Israelitic kingdom was later in origin than Israelitic nationality. The latter began as a theocracy at Sinai under an eldership which appeared sufficient for the demands both of peace and war. The astonishment that Moses "founded no state" (Vatke) and the conclusion therefrom that the Pentateuchal legislation must have arisen later in a state already in existence proceed from a false view of the Hebrew state. The bond of Hebrew nationality was the covenant with Yahweh, which based legal relations upon prophetic authority. A human kingdom was superfluous since Yahweh was king and leader in war (Ex. xv. 18, xiv. 14; Num. xxi. 14), with that leadership incarnated in Moses. But the time came when no mighty and prophetically inspired man like Moses or Joshua stood at the head of the people, when the spiritual bond was not strong enough to hold the scattered tribes together, when even the Yahweh worship was endangered by the disintegrating influences of Canaanitic heathenism. In the days of the Judges the need was felt of a central power to unify action, and this tendency was exemplified in the history of Gideon (q.v.) and Abimelech (Judges viii.–ix.), though the results of this premature attempt postponed for a long time definite establishment of the kingdom. When Samuel became too old for the performance of his duties and his sons proved unworthy, while the Philistines were aggressive, the demand became clamorous and Samuel yielded to the request of the people to anoint a king. Wellhausen mistakenly regards I Sam. ix. 1–x. 16, xi. as the early account of the founding of the kingdom and chap. viii. as the postexilic view. But chap. viii. is entirely consonant with the person and character of Samuel (see SAMUEL; SAUL). It was not by chance that a man from the smallest tribe was chosen king; the will of Yahweh determined the selection and chap. viii. supplies the account, basing the selection on Saul's worth. A similar reason underlay the choice of David. In both cases consecration to the kingly office was by anointing (I Sam. x. 1, xvi. 13), as was customary among the neighboring peoples. This anointing was connected with religious usage and implied divine sanction. In David's case it was repeated when he was made king over Judah and again when he became king of Israel (II Sam. ii. 4, v. 3). Prophetic anointing is often mentioned, as in the cases of Absalom, Solomon, Jehoahaz, and Jehu (II Sam. xix. 10; I Kings i. 39; II Kings xi. 12, xxiii. 30). The rabbis regarded anointing as necessary only to the establishment of a new dynasty and thus explain omissions of anointing in other cases. A symbol of kingly power was the scepter, in place of which Saul appears to have used the spear. From early times the crown also is in evidence (I Sam. i. 10), and the throne appears with Solomon (I Kings x. 18).

Kingly Duties and Privileges.

The position of the king was from the first not that of an Oriental despot with unlimited power. The law of the kingdom (I Sam. x. 25; cf. Deut. xvii. 14–20) was naturally not a mere embodiment of popular law and custom, but arose out of the religious situation of the Hebrews. The king was to be an Israelite, was not to multiply wives or wealth or horses (as evidences of his glory). Further he was to regard the torah, written and prophetic, as his guide. In war he was the leader, and in peace the chief authority in justice. As judge he was to be humble in mind, giving access to those who sought relief; his responsibility to Yahweh was urged by the prophets. As Yahweh had made free choice of the king, so he might reject and displace him (I Sam. xiii. 13–14; I Kings xi. 29 sqq.). The succession was hereditary, but the power of appointment of a successor was in the reigning king, with the mothers of the various princes exercising influence behind the throne. Often the succession was otherwise determined—by the nobility, the priesthood, and indeed the people. The queen mother had a high and influential position from which, however, she might be deposed (I Kings xv. 13). In the northern kingdom also prophetic sanction was given to the kingship, as in the case of Jeroboam I. and Jehu (qq.v.). But in general other forces, including that of usurpation, were at work in Israel (Hos. viii. 4). In the cult the king took a commanding position, offering sacrifices, praying, and blessing the people. But in sacrificing, it might be that the priest was the actual officiant; indeed in later times it may be said that the king yielded to the priest his priestly functions. A limitation of the kingly privileges doubtless came into play and is in view in the legislation of Ezekiel. It was his duty (according to Ezekiel) to care for the ordinary and festival offerings, and in preexilic times he might appoint and dismiss priests (I Kings ii. 35), though he was in these matters not left to the exercise of arbitrary power.

The Royal Court and Revenues.

The king was surrounded with councilors and ministers who came to bear the name of princes as inmates of the royal palace; in addition to these he had personal servants about him, who often misused their power. The number of the officers was not set by law, but varied with the needs of the times; thus under David there were the general of the army, the captain of the guard, the recorder, the chancellor, and the overseer of labor; under Solomon appeared an upper officer over the twelve prefects of the districts, and an officer in charge of the household (I Kings iv. 5–6); with these went a large number of lesser officials of various grades and service, while later there came in eunuchs (perhaps the name of an office, I Kings xxii. 9, margin). The royal revenues were not at all times on the same basis, and I Sam. viii. 11 sqq. indicates possibilities of arbitrariness in the king's demands. Yet only profligate kings would override the rights of their subjects, as in the instance of Naboth, and in cases of aggression would usually have at least the semblance of right of action. Custom developed the perquisites of the king. Thus Amos vii. 1 indicates that to the king belonged the first cutting of the grass. The custom of making presents to the king is very early, and regularity developed it into tribute. Conquered peoples brought tribute (II Sam. viii. 2), as did those who placed themselves under the royal protection or did homage (II Sam. viii. 10; I Kings x. 25). Solomon put the Canaanites and even Israelites to forced labor. Of booty taken in war a considerable part was appropriated by the king, and the kings had usually their private estates. For the idealistic and prophetic development of the idea of the kingdom see MESSIAH, MESSIANISM. C. VON ORELLI.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: S. Oettli, *Das Königsideal des Alten Testament*, Greifswald, 1899; R. Smend, *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte*, Tübingen, 1899; the literature on the History of Israel under AHAB; later works cited under ARCHEOLOGY, BIBLICAL; and for the idealistic view of the monarchy the works under MESSIAH.

KINGSLEY, CHARLES: English clergyman and author; b. at Holne (20 m. s.w. of Exeter), Devonshire, June 12, 1819; d. at Eversley (26 m. n.e. of of Winchester), Hampshire, Jan. 23, 1875. He was a precocious child, fond of athletics and romantic in disposition; the scenery with which he was surrounded made a profound impression on his character. He received his education at Clifton, Helston, King's College, London, and Magdalene College, Cambridge, where he studied fitfully and allowed himself to be distracted by manifold interests. He had at this time little taste for theology, but finally decided to take orders, and was ordained in July, 1842, to the curacy of Eversley. There his duties were practical rather than theoretical, for the parish was in a state of utter decay. In 1845 he received the honorary appointment of canon of Middleham. His literary activities had already begun, and at London in 1848 appeared his drama *The Saint's Tragedy*, a play based on St. Elizabeth of Hungary, in which he voiced his disapproval of medieval asceticism, which, in his opinion, detracted from the sanctity of marriage. He became interested, on the other hand, in "Christian socialism," and contributed numerous papers to aid the cause. To this same influence were due his first two novels, *Alton Locke* (1850) and *Yeast* (1851), the latter originally contributed to *Fraser's Magazine.* In 1851 he caused considerable excitement by his defense of "Christian socialism" in a sermon in a London church, and was forbidden to preach in the diocese, although the prohibition was soon withdrawn, especially as the working classes warmly championed him. He was by no means a revolutionist, however, but in later life inclined to the Tory side, the explanation of his interest in "Christian socialism" being his desire to mold popular trends by practical Christianity. His position naturally exposed him to frequent attack, and in 1851, after refuting the criticisms aimed at the alleged immorality of his *Yeast,* he sought to gain much-needed rest by his first trip abroad, in which he visited the Rhine, thus laying the foundations for his *Two Years Ago* (1857). Meanwhile his pen had not been idle, and in 1853 appeared his *Hypatia,* a novel in which he attempted a covert attack on the asceticism of the High-church party. The novel had an immense vogue, although it did not escape criticism and is not without serious faults of construction.

His wife's health now obliged Kingsley to spend the winter and spring at Torquay and Bideford, his studies of natural history at the former place giving him the foundation for his *Glaucus* (1855) and the latter for his great historical novel *Westward Ho!* (1855). At Bideford, moreover, he formed a drawing class for young men in the same spirit of practicality with which he had lectured for a year on English literature at Queen's College in 1848. The unpopularity and prejudice against which Kingsley had thus far struggled were now ending. In 1859 he was appointed one of the queen's chaplains and in the following year received the professorship of modern history at Cambridge. Yet his tenure of office, which ended in his retirement in 1869, can scarcely be termed successful, for his mind was too versatile and too superficial for him to be a reliable historian. In 1864, moreover, he became involved in a controversy with John Henry Newman. In a review of a work by James Anthony Froude he accused the Roman Catholic clergy in general and Newman in particular of having but faint regard for truth for its own sake. Newman retorted, and upon Kingsley's replying with a pamphlet *What, then, does Dr. Newman mean?* his antagonist completely routed him with his famous *Apologia pro vita sua* (1864). About this time he wrote his *Water Babies* (1863) and a few years later his historical novel *Hereward the Wake* (1866), but his health was beginning to fail, and in 1864 he was obliged to make a trip to France, while in the following year he was likewise forced to take a vacation of three months on the Norfolk coast. After resigning his professorship at Cambridge he was for a time prominent in the Educational League and also acted as president of the section for education at the Social Science Congress at Bristol in Oct., 1869. In the same year he made a visit to the West Indies, embodying the result of his observations in his *At Last* (1870). He now took up his residence at Chester, where he had been appointed canon, and founded a class in botany, his interests in science becoming more and more pronounced, so that he finally regarded Darwinism as in harmony with theology. He remained at Chester only three years, however, for in 1873 he was appointed canon of Westminister. His enfeebled health again forced him to seek a change of scene, and in 1874 he made a tour of America, but returned to England with little benefit from his trip, dying on a visit to his old parish.

Charles Kingsley was an earnest and consistent advocate of what was somewhat derisively called "muscular Christianity," and his enthusiasm for practical work among the poor, like his interest in science, especially in its popular aspects, was unfeigned. He can scarcely be regarded, on the other hand, as a theologian, although he was throughout his life a firm adherent of the Broad-church party, his opposition to the Tractarian movement being so pronounced as to lead Pusey and his colleagues in the High-church wing to make a successful protest against conferring an Oxford degree on him. The inscription on his tomb in the churchyard at Eversley strikingly attests the affection of his parishioners: *Amavimus, amamus, amabimus,* "We loved, love, and shall love (him)." His chief theological works were his *Twenty-five Village Sermons* (London, 1849); *Sermons on National Subjects* (2 vols., 1852–54); *Sermons for the Times* (1855); *The Good News of God* (1859); *Town and Country Sermons* (1861); *Sermons on the Pentateuch* (1863); *David* (four University sermons, 1867); *The Water of Life and Other Sermons* (1867); *Discipline and other Sermons* (1868); *Westminster Sermons* (1874); and the posthumous *All Saints' Day and Other Sermons* (1878).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The chief source is *Charles Kingsley, His Letters and Memories of his Life, edited by his Wife,* London, 1877. Consult further: J. H. Rigg, *Modern Anglican Theology, with a Memoir of Canon Kingsley,* ib. 1880; A *Memoir* is prefixed by T. Hughes to *Alton Locke,* ib. 1881; M. Kaufmann, *Charles Kingsley, Christian Socialist and Social Reformer,* ib. 1892; J. A. R. Marriott, *Charles Kingsley, Novelist,* ib. 1892; E. Groth, *Charles Kingsley als Dichter und Sozialreformer,* Leipsic, 1893; C. W. Stubbs, *Charles Kingsley and the Christian Social Movement,* London, 1899; *DNB,* xxxi. 175–181.

KINSHIP, PRIMITIVE. See COMPARATIVE RELIGION, VI., 1, b, § 1.

KINSMAN, FREDERICK JOSEPH: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Delaware; b. at Warren, O., Sept. 27, 1868. He was educated at Keble College, Oxford (B.A., 1894); master at St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H. (1895–97); rector of St. Martin's, New Bedford, Mass. (1897–1900); professor of ecclesiastical history in Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn. (1900–03); and in the General Theological Seminary, New York City (1903–08). In 1908 he was consecrated bishop of Delaware.

KINSOLVING, GEORGE HERBERT: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Texas; b. at Liberty, Va., Apr. 28, 1849. He was educated at the University of Virginia and received his theological training at the Virginia Theological Seminary, from which he was graduated in 1873. He was ordered deacon in

1874 and priested in the following year. After being assistant at Christ Church, Baltimore, in 1874–75, he was rector of St. Mark's, Baltimore (1875–79), St. John's, Cincinnati, O. (1879–91), and the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia (1891–92). In 1892 he was consecrated bishop coadjutor of Texas, and in the following year, on the death of Bishop Alexander Gregg, became his successor.

KINSOLVING, LUCIEN LEE: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Southern Brazil; b. at Middleburg, Va., May 14, 1862. He studied at the University of Virginia and was graduated from the theological seminary at Alexandria, Va., in 1889. He was ordered deacon and ordained priest in the same year, and from 1889 to 1898 was a missionary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the state of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil, while in 1899 he was consecrated missionary bishop of Southern Brazil.

KIP, WILLIAM INGRAHAM: Protestant Episcopal bishop of California; b. in New York City Oct. 3, 1811; d. in San Francisco Apr. 7, 1893. He was educated at Rutgers and Yale (B.A., 1831), the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary of Virginia (1832–33), and the General Theological Seminary, from which he was graduated in 1835. He was ordered deacon in 1835 and priested in the same year. He was successively rector of St. Peter's, Morristown, N. J. (1835–36), curate of Grace Church, New York City (1836–37), and rector of St. Paul's, Albany, N. Y. (1837–53). In 1853 he was consecrated first missionary bishop of California, and four years later, when California was made a full bishopric, became diocesan. He wrote: *The History, Object, and Proper Observation of the Holy Season of Lent* (New York, 1843); *The Double Witness of the Church* (1884); *Christmas Holidays at Rome* (1845); *Early Jesuit Missions in North America* (1846); *The Early Conflicts of Christianity* (1850); *The Catacombs of Rome* (1854); *The Unnoticed Things of Scripture* (1868); *New York in the Olden Time* (1872); *Historical Scenes in the old Jesuit Missions* (1875); *The Church of the Apostles* (1877); and *The Early Days of my Episcopate* (1892); besides many addresses and episcopal charges.

KIPPIS, ANDREW: English non-conformist; b. at Nottingham Mar. 28, 1725; d. in London Oct. 8, 1795. He was prepared for the Presbyterian ministry at Philip Doddridge's academy at Northampton, where he spent the years 1741–46. He was pastor of dissenting congregations at Boston, Lincolnshire, 1746–50; at Dorking, Surrey, 1750–53; and at Westminster, London, 1753–95. From 1767 till 1784 he was classical and philological tutor in the Coward Academy at Hoxton, and was afterward a tutor in the dissenting academy at Hackney. He early abandoned Calvinism for Socinianism, was associated with many charities, and was a voluminous writer. His reputation rests upon his unfinished edition of the *Biographia Britannica* (5 vols. and part of vol. vi., London, 1778–95). Other works are: *A Vindication of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers* (1772); *Sermons on Practical Subjects* (1791); and lives of Nathaniel Lardner and Philip Doddridge for editions of their works.

Bibliography: Walter Wilson, *Hist. and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches*, iv. 103–117, 402, London, 1814; *DNB*, xxi. 195–197 (where references to other literature may be found); Julian, *Hymnology*, p. 625.

KIR, ker: A place-name mentioned II Kings xvi. 9; Isa. xxii. 6; and Amos i. 5, ix. 7 as within the Assyrian region and as the dwelling-place of an Aramaic people. Even the early translators did not know its location; the later translators followed J. D. Michaelis in placing it on the river still known as Kur and flowing into the Caspian. But the Assyrian kingdom never included this region. Schrader sought it in South Babylonia. The correct position is given by Winckler as the plain of Jatbur, between the Tigris and the mountains, and bordering on Elam, the land of the Karians mentioned by Arrian (III., viii. 5) near Sittakene. Winckler regards the *Ḳir* as a mistake for *Ḳor*. That Aramaic peoples were inhabitants of the region appears both from the Bible (II Kings xvi. 9), and from the inscriptions, since Tiglath-Pileser transported Damascans thither. It seems probable that this was the original home of the Arameans, whither they were deported after the manner of Isa. xxxvii. 29. In Amos i. 5 and ix. 7 the word seems to be a later intrusion.

(A. Jeremias.)

Bibliography: H. Winckler, *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, ii. 253 sqq., Nachtrag, p. 378, Leipsic, 1892; idem, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, pp. 178–179, ib. 1894.

KIRCHER, kîr'ʜer, **ATHANASIUS:** German Jesuit; b. at Geisa (30 m. n.e. of Fulda) May 2, 1602; d. in Rome Nov. 28, 1680. He joined the Society of Jesus at Mainz in 1618, and afterward became teacher of philosophy and mathematics at Würzburg. On the invasion of the Swedes in 1631 he fled to Avignon, whence he repaired to Rome in 1635. For eight years he taught mathematics at the Collegium Romanum and founded in the college a museum that has preserved his name. He was a scholar of varied attainments and wrote numerous books on mathematics, physics, natural history, philosophy, philology, history, and archeology. While his writings are now antiquated, Kircher is important for his work as a pioneer, particularly in the field of Egyptian hieroglyphics. To be mentioned are: *Prodromus Coptus sive Ægyptiacus* (Rome, 1636); *Œdipus Ægyptiacus* (3 vols., 1652–1655); *China . . . illustrata* (Amsterdam, 1667); and *Latium* (1671).

Bibliography: His autobiography is in A. Langenmantel, *Fasciculus epistolarum*, A. Kircheri, pp. 65 sqq., Augsburg, 1684; A. and A. de Backer, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la société de Jésus*, Liége, 1853–61; *KL*, vii. 716–717.

KIRCHHOFER, kîrʜ'hōf-er, **MELCHIOR:** Swiss church historian; b. at Schaffhausen Jan. 3, 1775; d. at Stein (11 m. e.s.e. of Schaffhausen) Feb. 13, 1853. He studied theology and philosophy at Marburg 1794–96, took orders in 1797, and held various country pastorates till 1808, when he became pastor at Stein, in the canton of Schaffhausen, and remained there till his death. In his works Kirchhofer combined a calm and objective manner of presentation with thoroughness and soundness of investigation. He wrote monographs on Sebastian Hofmeister (Zurich, 1808), Oswald Myconius (1813), Werner Steiner (1818), Berthold Haller (1828), and Guillaume Farel (2 vols., 1831–33; Eng. transl. London, 1837), and continued Hottinger's *Helvetische Kirchengeschichte* (ed. L. Wirz, 5 parts, 1808–19). He also published the *Schaffhauserische Jahrbücher* (Schaffhausen, 1819–29), and *Neujahrsblätter für die schaffhauserische Jugend* (1822–1843), which contain a history of Schaffhausen until the incorporation of the city into the Swiss Confederacy in 1501, besides some smaller pamphlets, tracts, and criticisms. (C. A. Baechtold.)

Bibliography: Biographical material is contained in the funeral address of J. Böschenstein, Schaffhausen, 1853.

KIRCHMEYER, kîrн′mai″er, **THOMAS (NAOGEORGUS):** Protestant theologian and religious dramatist; b. at Hubelschmeiss near Straubing (25 m. s.e. of Regensburg) c. 1508; d. probably at Wiesloch (8 m. s. of Heidelberg) Dec. 24, 1563. He was educated at Tübingen, though his name does not appear in the university lists, and received an excellent training in the humanities and took the master's degree. He embraced with passionate zeal the cause of the Reformation but at the same time was bold in maintaining his individual beliefs against the authority of the great Protestant theologians. He first appears as pastor of Sulza, in present Saxe-Weimar, 1535. In 1537 he is described by Nicholas Medler of Naumburg as a thoughtful man, who did not hesitate to express his dissent from the authorities at Wittenberg, and was therefore "prone to all heresies and seditions." In 1541 he became pastor at Kahla. Before this, however, he had written his trilogy of dramas against the Roman church upon which his fame is founded: *Pammachius* (Wittenberg, 1538), *Mercator* (1540), and *Incendia* (1541). At Kahla the Wittenberg theologians refused to allow his commentary on the first epistle of John to be printed because in it he taught that the elect, even when they sin against their own conscience, remain in a state of grace and in possession of the Holy Ghost. Melanchthon sought to gain him over from this opinion; and in 1544 Luther, Melanchthon, and Bugenhagen justified their condemnation of his work in a communication to the elector with whom Kirchmeyer stood in great favor. He accompanied the court to the diet of Speyer in 1544 and in the same year published the prohibited book with a dedication to Johann Ernst of Saxony. The followers of Luther thenceforward regarded Kirchmeyer as an opponent and after the death of the great Reformer new controversies arose as to his orthodoxy. In addition to the charge already brought against him he was accused of preaching the Zwinglian conception of the Lord's Supper. Impeached by Kasper Aquila of Saalfeld he was tried before the consistory of Weimar under the presidency of Duke Johann Wilhelm, and acquitted of the charge, but being ordered to explain himself on some points to his congregation he left Kahla and spent many years in wandering through Switzerland and South Germany.

Kirchmeyer's dramas contain little action and deal with personifications instead of real persons, after the fashion of the old Moralities, but they are marked by a spirit of bitter criticism of Roman Catholic teachings and practises which naturally made them popular in Protestant circles. Besides the three plays already mentioned he wrote also three Biblical dramas, *Hamanus* (1543), *Hieremias* (1551) and *Judas Iscariotes* (1553), all translated into German. Of polemical works, the most celebrated is the *Regnum papisticum* (Basil ? 1553), an unrestrained denunciation in verse of the Roman church [Eng. trans., The Popish Kingdome, London, 1570, rep. 1880]. Minor works are the *Agriculturæ sacræ libri V.* (1550), and the *Satyrarum libri quinque* (1555). He was also the author of many translations from Greek into Latin, including Sophocles, Isocrates, Epictetus, Dio Chrysostom, Plutarch, and Synesius. In 1551 he published a summary of canon law which attained great popularity, owing to its impartial treatment of many controverted subjects; yet strangely enough it is this work that led the way to the *Regnum papisticum*. His independent spirit finds repeated expression in his Latin verse wherein he does not hesitate to sing the praises of men of the old faith, among them Erasmus, to whom he concedes much merit as a pioneer of the Reformation. (G. Kawerau.)

Bibliography: L. Theobald, in *NKZ*, 1906, pp. 764 sqq.; idem, *Das Leben und Wirken des . . . Thomas Naogeorgus . . .*, Leipsic, 1908; G. T. Strobel, *Miscellaneen litterarischen Inhalts*, iii. 107–154, Nuremberg, 1780; J. J. I. von Döllinger, *Die Reformation*, ii. 134 sqq., Regensburg, 1848; H. Holstein, *Die Reformation im Spiegelbilde der dramatischen Litteratur des 16. Jahrhunderts*, pp. 198 sqq., Halle, 1886; J. Janssen, *Hist. of the German People*, xii. 75–92, London, 1907; *ADB*, xxiii. 245 sqq.

KIRK, EDWARD NORRIS: American Congregationalist; b. in New York Aug. 14, 1802; d. in Boston Mar. 27, 1874. He was graduated at the College of New Jersey (Princeton) in 1820 and at the Princeton Theological Seminary in 1825, and traveled in the southern States as agent of the American Board 1826–28. He was pastor of a Presbyterian church in Albany 1828–37, secretary of the Foreign Evangelical Society 1839–42, and pastor of the Mount Vernon Congregational Church in Boston 1842–71. During the years 1837–39 he traveled in Europe and preached for several months in Paris. He was a successful evangelist, one of the first members of the Evangelical Alliance, and a vigorous advocate of the evangelization of the Roman Catholic countries of Europe. His writings include: *Memorial of Rev. John Chester* (Albany, 1829); *Sermons* (New York, 1840); *Lectures on Christ's Parables* (1856); a second volume of *Sermons* (Boston, 1860); and *Lectures on Revivals* (ed. D. O. Mears, 1874).

Bibliography: D. O. Mears, *Life of Edward Norris Kirk*, Boston, 1877.

KIRK, HARRIS ELLIOTT: Presbyterian; b. at Pulaski, Giles Co., Tenn., Oct. 12, 1872. He is a graduate of the academic and theological departments of the Southwestern University, Clarksville, Tenn.; was pastor of Cottage Presbyterian Church, Nashville, Tenn., 1897–99, of the First Presbyterian Church, Florence, Ala., 1899–1901, and of Franklin Street Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, 1901–09. In 1909 he was called to the chair of polemics in Princeton Theological Seminary. He is a "progressive conservative, believing in the adaptation of the essential views of the conservative theology to modern conditions in a sympathetic and constructive way." He has written a number of essays, and *The Lost Book* (Richmond, 1905).

KIRKLAND, JOHN THORNTON: American Congregationalist, son of Samuel Kirkland (q.v.); b. at Herkimer, N. Y., Aug. 17, 1770; d. in Boston Apr. 26, 1840. He studied at Phillips Academy (Andover), and at Harvard College (B.A., 1789), where, while preparing for the ministry, he was tutor in logic and metaphysics 1792–94. He was pastor of the New South Church, Boston, 1794–1810, and president of Harvard College 1810–28. Under his vigorous administration three new buildings were erected and the course of study was greatly extended. He published several sermons, and a *Life of Fisher Ames*, printed in Ames' *Works* (Boston, 1809).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. E. Dunning, *Congregationalists in America*, pp. 293, 296, New York, 1894; *National Cyclopædia of American Biography*, vi. 417, ib. 1896.

KIRKLAND, SAMUEL: American missionary to the Iroquois Indians; b. at Norwich, Conn., Dec. 1, 1741; d. at Clinton, N. Y., Feb. 28, 1808. He was graduated at the College of New Jersey (Princeton) in 1765, and on his return from a visit to the Senecas in 1766 was ordained into the Congregational ministry and sent as missionary to the Six Nations. During the Revolution he served as a chaplain in the army. For persuading the Oneidas and Tuscaroras to remain neutral he was rewarded by Congress with a large grant of land in 1785. At the close of the war he resumed his missionary work. In 1791 he conducted a delegation of some forty warriors to Philadelphia to meet Congress and discuss methods of introducing civilization among the tribes; and in 1793 he founded the Hamilton Oneida Academy (now Hamilton College) for the education of American and Indian youth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: S. K. Lothrop, in J. Spark, *Library of American Biography*, 10 vols., New York, 1848–51; W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, i. 623–630, ib. 1869.

KIRKPATRICK, ALEXANDER FRANCIS: Church of England; b. at Lewes (50 m. s. of London), Sussex, June 25, 1849. He studied at Trinity College, Cambridge (B.A., 1871), where he was elected fellow in 1871. He was ordered deacon in 1874 and ordained priest in 1875. He was assistant tutor in Trinity College 1871–82 and junior proctor 1881–82, and from the latter year until 1903 was regius professor of Hebrew and canon of Ely. Since 1903 he has been Lady Margaret professor of divinity and honorary canon of Ely. He was university preacher in 1875, 1878, 1882, 1889, 1897, and 1903, Cambridge Whitehall preacher in 1878–1880, Lady Margaret preacher in 1882 and 1893, and Warburtonian lecturer at Lincoln's Inn in 1886–1890. He was examining chaplain to the bishop of Winchester 1878–90, the bishop of Rochester 1891–95, and again to the bishop of Winchester 1895–1903, and since 1903 has been examining chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury. He has also been master of Selwyn College, Cambridge, since 1898, and besides being the general editor of the Old Testament and Apocrypha for the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, for which series he has prepared the volumes on I and II Samuel (2 vols., London, 1880–81) and the Psalms (3 vols., 1890–1901), has written *The Divine Library of the Old Testament* (1891) and *The Doctrine of the Prophets* (Warburtonian lectures; 1892).

KIRKUS, WILLIAM: Protestant Episcopalian; b. at Hull, England, May 9, 1830; d. in Brooklyn, July 10, 1907. He was educated at Lancashire Independent College, Manchester, and at the University of London (B.A., 1849). He then entered the Congregational ministry, and was assistant minister of Craven Chapel, London, 1850–52, minister of St. Thomas Square Chapel, Hackney, London, 1852–68, and of Longsight Chapel, Manchester, 1868–70. From 1870 until 1872 he was headmaster of Broughton High School, Manchester. In 1872 he was admitted to deacon's orders in the Church of England and became curate at Cheatham Hill, Manchester. In the same year he came to the United States, and, being ordained to the priesthood, was curate of Grace Church, New York City, from 1873 to 1875. He was then rector of Christ Church, Baltimore, Md., 1875–76, and rector of St. Michael and All Angels in the same city 1876–92. In 1892 he retired from active parochial work to devote himself to literature. Besides editing *The American Literary Churchman* (Baltimore) from 1881 to 1885 and writing two novels under the pseudonym of Florence Williamson, he published *Christianity, Theoretical and Practical* (London, 1854); *Miscellaneous Essays* (2 vols., 1833–69); *Orthodoxy, Scripture, and Reason* (1865); and *Religion, a Revelation and Rule of Life* (New York, 1886).

KIRN, OTTO: German Protestant; b. at Heslach (a suburb of Stuttgart) Jan. 23, 1857. He studied at the theological seminaries of Maulbronn and Blaubeuren and at the University of Tübingen (1875–80; lic. theol., 1886; Ph.D., 1889), and after being lecturer at the theological seminary at Tübingen 1881–84, was deacon at Besigheim, Württemberg, until 1889. In 1889 he became privat-docent at the University of Basel, where he was appointed associate professor in 1890 and full professor in 1894. Since 1895 he has been professor of dogmatic theology at the University of Leipsic. He has written *Ueber Wesen und Begründung der religiösen Gewissheit* (Basil, 1889); *Schleiermacher und die Romantik* (1895); *Glaube und Geschichte* (Leipsic, 1900); *Grundriss der evangelischen Dogmatik* (1905); *Grundriss der theologischen Ethik* (1906); and many addresses and sermons.

KIRWAN, WALTER BLAKE: Church of Ireland; b. of Roman Catholic parents at Gort (18 m. s.e. of Galway), County Galway, Ireland, in the year 1754; d. at Mount Pleasant, near Dublin, Oct. 27, 1805. He studied in the Jesuit College of Saint Omer, France; lived at Saint Croix (or Santa Cruz), Lesser Antilles, with a relative who was a large landed proprietor, but ill health caused his return to Europe. He entered the Franciscan order, studied in the College of St. Anthony of Padua, at Louvain, where he became instructor in natural and moral philosophy, and in that city was admitted to the priesthood. From 1778 to 1785 he was chaplain to the Neapolitan ambassador at the British court. His eloquent sermons attracted attention, but, shaken in his allegiance to the Roman Church in 1785, he went into retirement and two years later declared himself a Protestant. On June 27 he preached his first sermon as such in St. Peter's Church, Dublin, and was henceforth identified with the Church of Ireland. He never would, however, say anything against his former coreligionists. In 1788 he became rector of St. Nicholas-Without, Dublin, and held this place till his death, from 1800 in connection with the deanship of Killala, County Mayo. In 1798 he married and was survived by his wife and four children. He had great pulpit power, but is chiefly remembered for his sermons in behalf of charities, as he had remarkable ability in inducing persons to give. Of the thirteen sermons which were published by his widow (London, 1814, 2d ed., 1816, reprinted Philadelphia, 1816) eleven are charity sermons, and although the present reader can not give them their pristine attractiveness, they are interesting and moving discourses (one of them is reprinted in H. C. Fish's *Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence*, i. 581–592). In the British Museum are two volumes of his Latin theses, one on Biblical chronology and the other on the Decalogue (Louvain, 1775 and 1776).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A sketch of his life, probably by his widow, is prefaced to his *Sermons* as above. Consult also *DNB*, xxxii. 230.

KIS, STEPHANUS (called **Szegedinus** from his birthplace): Hungarian Reformer; b. at Szeged (96 m. s.e. of Budapest) 1515; d. at Ráczkeve (22 m. s.s.w. of Budapest) 1572. He studied at Vienna and Cracow, and under Melanchthon at Wittenberg 1543–45. He served as school-teacher in his native land, suffering persecution for his faith until Peter Petrovics, commander of Temesvar under Queen Isabella and a Calvinist, took him into favor and made him rector of his school (1548). Political changes brought Temesvar under Ferdinand of Hapsburg, Petrovics was succeeded by a Roman Catholic in 1552, and all Protestant pastors and teachers were driven from the town. Kis found refuge under Turkish dominion, but the ill will of the Romanists followed him and, on their complaint, he was kept imprisoned in chains for a year and a half by a Turkish pasha until his friends released him by a heavy ransom in 1563. Henceforth he lived in quiet at Ráczkeve, acting as superintendent of thirty-five congregations under Turkish rule. He was the greatest scholar among the Hungarian Reformers and his works made him known in all Europe. They are: (1) *Theologiae sincerae loci communes* (Basel, 1585), preceded by a sketch of his life by his scholar and successor at Ráczkeve, Matthæus Skaricza, which is also an important source for the history of the Reformation in Hungary and contains a couplet by Paulus Turi, another of the pupils of Kis, on Calvin's "Institutes":

Praeter apostolicas post Christi tempora chartas
Huic peperere libro saecula nulla parem.

(cf. The *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, Apr., 1899, p. 194). (2) *Speculum pontificum Romanorum* (Basel, 1584; 5th ed., 1624; Germ. transl., 1586); (3) *Assertio vera de trinitate* (Geneva, 1573, edited by Beza); (4) *Tabulae analyticae* (Schaffhausen, 1592). F. BALOGH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The Life by Matthæus Skaricza was republished, Basel, 1608, cf. *Miscellanea Groeningana* vi. 1, pp. 508–559, 1762. A life in Hungarian, by Ladislaus Földvari, appeared at Budapest, 1899.

KISS OF PEACE: (Gk. *philēma hagion, philēma agapēs, aspasmos, eirēnē;* Lat. *osculum sanctum, osculum pacis, salutatio, pax*): An expression which occurs five times in the New Testament at the close of an apostolic message (Rom. xvi. 16; I Cor. xvi. 20; II Cor. xiii. 12; I Thess. v. 26; I Pet. v. 14) in the exhortation "Salute one another with an holy kiss" or an equivalent expression. A congregational assembly before which the letters were read aloud is assumed, and a custom of the synagogue may be involved (cf. *The Expositor*, ix. 1894, p. 461). The import of the holy kiss is a general attestation of brotherly love on the ground of religious fellowship, and it is not to be considered an independent liturgical ceremony.

After the middle of the second century the kiss of peace has an established place in public worship and a definite connection with the Eucharist, in the transition from the prayers preceding and introducing that solemnity to the act of consecration. This place is assigned to it in Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria terms it "a mystery." The liturgical sources and liturgies of the Eastern Church attest the subsequent continuance of the practise in the same context. At the outset, moreover, this ordinance appears to have been frequently in force in the West. Only in Rome and North Africa, the kiss of peace occurred not before the consecration, but between consecration and communion, an arrangement, which, in course of time, became the prevailing one in the Latin Church (see MASS, II.). The modification is doubtless to be explained by an endeavor to associate the practise immediately with the eucharistic solemnity, toward which it is directed. For in this context the kiss of peace has its basis and significance under the words of the Lord, "First be reconciled with thy brother, etc." (Matt. v. 23 sqq.), wherein agreement or unity is accentuated. The ceremony was begun by the clergy among themselves, and the congregation followed. It is to be assumed that originally the separation of the sexes was duly observed; and to prevent disorder, this point was repeatedly and insistently emphasized in later times.

In Western Christendom the kiss of peace continued to be observed until the waning period of the Middle Ages, though it is an open question to what extent and in what particular forms. The East appears to have given up the general kiss of peace still earlier. In both divisions of Christendom there was substituted in its place the practise of kissing the altar, the sacred elements, or the stole by the clergy, and kissing the hand by both clergy and laity. It was only transiently that they followed, in the West, the precedent purporting to have been adopted by Bishop Walter of York (1250), of using the "kiss tablet" (*osculatorium, pax*), a metal, or, in some cases, marble disc exhibiting the cross or sacred figures. Relics or even the book of the Gospels were sometimes employed in the practise. At a later period the *osculatorium* was withheld from the laity and reserved exclusively for the clergy.

If not quite unrelated, still in only a very general relation to the holy kiss, is the kiss bestowed on neophytes, after the sacrament of baptism; on penitents when reinstated in full communion; on the dead; and on candidates for ordination.

VICTOR SCHULTZE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *DB*, iii. 5–6; *EB*, iv. 4252–54; Bingham, *Origines*, II., xi. 10, xix. 17, IV., vi. 15, XII., iv. 5, XV., iii. 3; E. Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus*, I., iii. 4–5, Antwerp, 1736; A. J. Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, i. 1, pp. 163, 492, iv. 3, p. 485, Mainz, 1825–27; W. Palmer, *Antiquities of the English Ritual*, vol. ii., London, 1845; *DCA*, ii. 902–906.

KIST, NICOLAAS CHRISTIAN: Dutch theologian; b. at Bommel (25 m. e. of Dort) Apr. 11, 1793; d. at Leyden Dec. 21, 1859. After completing his theological education at Utrecht, he served for five years as pastor at Zoelen, but in 1823 was appointed professor of historical theology at Leyden, where he spent the remainder of his life. His chief works were *De Christelijke Kerk op aarde* (Haarlem, 1830); *Nederlands bededagen en biddagsbrieven* (2 vols., Leyden, 1848–49); and *Orationes quae ecclesiae reique Christianae spectant historiam quattuor* (1853). He likewise collaborated with H. J. Roijaards in establishing and editing the *Archief voor kerkelijke geschiedenis* and its immediate continuations under similar names (22 vols., Leyden, and Schiedam, 1829–54), and with W. Moll in founding and editing the *Kerkhistorisch archief* (4 vols., Amsterdam, 1855–66). (C. SEPP†.)

KITCHIN, GEORGE WILLIAM: Church of England; b. at Naughton Rectory, Ipswich (23 m. s.e. of Bury St. Edmunds), Suffolk, Dec. 7, 1827. He studied at Christ Church, Oxford (B.A., 1850; M.A., 1852), and was ordered deacon in 1852 and ordained priest in 1859. He was classical tutor of his college, censor and junior proctor, chaplain to the bishop of Chester (1871–72), tutor of the crown prince of Denmark, censor of non-collegiate students in the University of Oxford (1868–83), and lecturer and tutor in history in Christ Church (1870–83). In 1883 he became dean of Winchester, and in 1894 dean of Durham and warden of the University of Durham. He was select preacher at Oxford 1863–1864, Whitehall preacher 1866–67, commissary to the bishop of Gibraltar 1874–1904, and is an honorary fellow of King's College, London, and an honorary student of Christ Church. In theology he is a moderate liberal. His publications include: *Bacon's Novum Organum* (2 vols., Oxford, 1855); *Bacon's Advancement of Learning* (London, 1860); *Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of Christ Church, Oxford* (Oxford, 1867); *A History of France* (3 vols., 1873–77); *Life of Pope Pius II.* (1881); *Winchester Cathedral Records* (2 vols., Winchester, 1886); *Documents Relating to the Foundation of the Chapter of Winchester, A.D. 1541–1547* (London, 1889); *Winchester* (1890); *Rolls of the Obedientaries of St. Swithin's Priory, A.D. 1309–1534* (Winchester, 1895); *The Manor of Marydown, Hampshire* (1895); *Edward Harold Browne, Bishop of Winchester: A Memoir* (London, 1895); and *Ruskin in Oxford, and other Studies* (1904).

KITTEL, RUDOLF: German Protestant; b. at Ehningen (15 m. s.w. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, Mar. 28, 1853. He studied at Tübingen 1871–76 (Ph.D., 1879), and, after being a pastor 1876–79, was lecturer at Tübingen 1879–81. He was then professor in a gymnasium at Stuttgart until 1888, when he was appointed professor of Old-Testament exegesis at the University of Breslau, where he was rector in 1896–97. Since 1898 he has been professor of the same subject at Leipsic. He has translated Judges and Samuel for E. F. Kautzsch's *Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments* (Freiburg, 1892); and the Psalms of Solomon for the same scholar's *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (Tübingen, 1898); edited Chronicles for *SBOT* (New York, 1895); C. F. A. Dillmann's *Handbuch der alttestamentlichen Theologie* (Leipsic, 1895); the sixth edition of the same scholar's *Kommentar zu Jesaja* (1898); and *Biblia Hebraica* (in collaboration with various other scholars; Leipsic, 1905–07). He is likewise the editor of *Saat auf Hoffnung*, and has written: *Sittliche Fragen* (Stuttgart, 1883); *Geschichte der Hebräer* (2 vols., Gotha, 1888–92; Eng. transl. by J. Taylor, H. W. Hogg, and E. B. Spiers, 2 vols., London, 1895); *Aus dem Leben des Propheten Jesaia* (Gotha, 1894); *Die Anfänge der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament* (Leipsic, 1896); commentaries on Kings and Chronicles (in W. Nowack's *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament;* Göttingen, 1900–02); *Die orientalischen Ausgrabungen und die ältere biblische Geschichte* (Leipsic, 1903); *Der Babel-Bibelstreit und die Offenbarungsfrage* (Leipsic, 1903); and *Studien zur hebräischen Archäologie und Religionsgeschichte* (1908), *in Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament*, which he edits.

KITTIM. See TABLE OF THE NATIONS.

KITTO, JOHN: English Biblical scholar; b. at Plymouth Dec. 4, 1804; d. at Cannstadt, Germany, Nov. 25, 1854. In his eleventh year he had to leave school to assist his father, a stonemason, and in 1817, while carrying slates up a high ladder, he suffered a fall that rendered him completely deaf for the rest of his life. Cut off from ordinary society by this infirmity he now devoted himself to study and resorted to various expedients for earning pennies to procure books. With the exception of a few months spent as apprentice to an ill-natured Plymouth shoemaker, he was in the workhouse from Nov., 1819, till July, 1823. Friends then provided for his support and secured permission for him to use the public library, and in 1824 A. N. Groves (q.v.), a dentist at Exeter, took him as a pupil. In July, 1825, he entered the Missionary College at Islington to learn printing, and in June, 1827, he went to Malta as a printer in the employ of the Church Missionary Society. In Jan., 1829, he returned to England, and the following June he joined Groves' private mission party as tutor to Groves' children. The party reached Bagdad in December. In 1833 he returned to England, obtained employment with Charles Knight, then editor of the publications of the Society for the

Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, and wrote industriously for Knights' *Penny Magazine* and *Penny Cyclopædia*. Through connections formed with London and Edinburgh publishers he was now enabled to follow his literary bent and make for himself an enviable reputation as a popular writer on Eastern and Biblical subjects. In 1844, though a layman, he was created D.D. by the University of Giessen; in 1845 he was elected a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries; and in 1850, in recognition of his "useful and meritorious literary works," a civil list pension of £100 per annum was conferred upon him. His last years were saddened by ill health and financial difficulties. When, in Feb., 1854, he was forced to stop work, generous friends contributed to his support and enabled him to spend the last three months of his life in Germany. The works for which Kitto is particularly remembered are: *The Pictorial Bible* (3 vols., London, 1835–38); *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1843–45), which he edited and largely wrote; and *Daily Bible Illustrations* (8 vols., 1849–53). Other works deserving mention are: *Pictorial History of Palestine* (2 vols., London, 1841); and *The Lost Senses* (2 parts, 1845). He also founded and edited the *Journal of Sacred Literature* (London, 1848–53).

Bibliography: Biographical matter is contained in *The Lost Senses*, ut sup. Consult: J. E. Ryland, *Memoirs of John Kitto. . . . with a critical Estimate of Dr. Kitto's Life and Writings by Professor Eadie*, Edinburgh, 1856; J. Eadie, *Life of J. Kitto*, ib. 1882; W. M. Thayer, *From Poor-House to Pulpit; the Triumphs of . . . John Kitto*, Boston, 1859; *DNB*, xxxi. 233–235.

KLARENBACH, klār′en-bāch, **ADOLF:** German Reformer; b. at Lüttringhausen (17 m. s.e. of Düsseldorf), in the latter part of the fifteenth century; executed at Cologne Sept. 28, 1529. He was educated at Lennep, at Münster (where he came under the influence both of the Brethren of the Common Life—see Common Life, Brethren of the—and of the humanists), and at the Laurentian seminary in Cologne, over which presided Arnold of Tongern, later one of his judges. For a time after receiving his degree in 1517 nothing is known of him, but within a few years he was a teacher in a Latin school at Münster. He had already come to sympathize with the principles of the Reformation, perhaps through the influence of his mother, and he was obliged to leave the city on a charge of insulting the cross. In 1524 Klarenbach was associate rector at the municipal school of Wesel, a town strongly in favor of the new faith. There, though he had never taken orders, he seems to have assumed ecclesiastical functions, aided by a number of others who had become disaffected with Roman Catholic tenets. The hostility of the monks obliged him to leave Wesel for Osnabrück after two years, and in his new home he taught Latin, in addition to giving Protestant lectures on certain books of the New Testament and the dialectics of Melanchthon. His activity roused the opposition of the cathedral chapter of Osnabrück, but he declined a call to Meldorp, feeling that his duty summoned him rather to Lennep, where he settled shortly after Easter, 1527. The attacks there made upon him evoked his chief literary work in 1527, in which he assailed the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church and defended Protestant tenets. Expelled from Lennep, Klarenbach turned to his old friend Johann Klopreis, the ex-parish priest of Büderich, who had already been cited before the spiritual court at Cologne. Under Klarenbach's inspiration, however, Klopreis became so outspoken in his sentiments that he was again summoned to appear before the court and was imprisoned, while Klarenbach, who had accompanied him to the trial to give him encouragement, was likewise placed in confinement on Apr. 3, 1528. Klopreis succeeded in making his escape Jan. 1, 1529, but his comrade was denied all hope of freedom.

The problem before the Roman Catholics of Cologne was a serious one, for Protestantism was beginning to work its way insidiously into this stronghold of Roman Catholicism in Germany; the citizens were distrustful of the clergy, and the university was declining under Luther's influence. In view of the importance of Klarenbach in the Protestant movement and his audacity in invading the center of archiepiscopal power, it became doubly necessary to make a terrible example of him. His trial was a long one, since not only the ecclesiastical court, but also the civil court of Cologne and even the imperial supreme court at Speyer were concerned. The latter wished Klarenbach to be released on condition that he would bring no claim for damages, but the court of the Inquisition refused to agree, and on Mar. 4, the sentence of death was imposed. The execution took place on Sept. 28, the delay being due to the fact that the populace was displeased at the verdict and must first be pacified. During the course of the summer, however, the city was visited by a plague, so that the conviction spread that this was a divine retribution for mercy to heretics, and the execution accordingly became feasible, especially in view of the repeated failures of the efforts made to induce him to retract his teachings. The German Protestants regarded Klarenbach and Peter Fliesteden, a somewhat fanatical character of whom little is known, but who was imprisoned with Klarenbach and died with him, as the martyrs of the Lower Rhine, and in 1829 the third centennial of the execution was publicly celebrated and a monument was erected in his honor.

The exact relation of Klarenbach to the Reformation is somewhat uncertain, but it seems probable, on the whole, that he was Biblical rather than professedly Lutheran, although he had read the works of the Wittenberg reformer, approving portions of them and rejecting others. On the other hand, the circumstances of his trial led him to emphasize certain aspects of his beliefs and to pass over others more lightly. Noteworthy features of his defense were his frequent use of the term "brethren," an appellation rare with Luther, and his rigid avoidance of taking an oath, apparently due to the influence of the old Evangelical thought as exemplified by the Waldenses, Moravian Brethren, and the Anabaptists. [While he held that "there is no satisfaction for sin save the death of Christ alone," he yet insisted that "our good works are signs, witnesses and pledges of such faith in Christ." He rejected transubstantiation and consubstantiation alike, insisting that the elements in communion are " only external signs and nothing more." He defines baptism as " dipping into the water and drawing out again " and as inviting death to all fleshly lust and a putting on of a new man and the leading henceforth of a spiritual life. Cf. extracts in Rembert, pp. 134 sqq. A. H. N.]

(E. Bratke†.)

Bibliography: *Epistola Johannis Romberch . . . in qua narratur . . . tragoedia . . . Adolphi Clarenbach*, Cologne, 1530, ed. E. Bratke and A. Carsted in *Theologische Arbeiten aus dem rheinischen . . . Predigerverein*, Freiburg, 1898; C. Krafft, *Geschichte . . . Adolf Clarenbach und Peter Fliesteden*, Elberfeld, 1886; E. Densmer, *Geschichte der Reformation am Niederrhein*, Düsseldorf, 1899; K. Rembert, *Die "Wiedertäufer" in Herzogtum Jülich*, pp. 114–137 et passim, Berlin, 1899.

KLARER, klār′er, **WALTER:** Swiss Reformer; b. at Hundwil, canton of Appenzell, 1499; d. there 1566. He attended the schools in St. Gall, Schaffhausen, and Bern, and then spent four years in the Stipendium regium at Paris, where he studied canon law. He joined the Reformation at its very start, and in 1522 became pastor in his native town. In 1531 he officiated at Herisau, in 1532 at Gossau. During the following ten years he was preacher of Urnäsch, in the canton of Appenzell, and from 1543 to 1566 again in Hundwil. He took part in a number of important conferences and disputations, including the Disputation of Bern in 1528. In 1565 he wrote, from memory, a brief history of the Reformation in Appenzell from 1521 to 1531 (ed. J. J. Simler, from a German copy, the original being lost, in *Sammlung alter und neuer Urkunden*, pp. 803–840, Zurich, 1759; reprinted by Heim from another German copy in the Appenzell Year Book for 1873, pp. 86–106). (Emil Egli†.)

Bibliography: Some data from autobiographic sources appeared, ed. Walser, in *Appenzeller Chronik*, 1740, pp. 390–391; other material is scattered through the sources of the history of the Swiss Reformation.

KLAUS, BROTHER. See Flue, Nikolaus von (der).

KLEINERT, klɑin′ert, **HUGO WILHELM PAUL:** German Protestant; b. at Vielguth (near Bernstadt, 22 m. e. of Breslau), Silesia, Sept. 25, 1837. He studied at Breslau and Halle (Ph.D., 1857; lic. theol., Breslau, 1860), and was deacon and teacher of religion at the gymnasium of Oppeln 1861–63, and teacher in the Friedrich-Wilhelm gymnasium in Berlin 1863–65. He was then inspector at the Domkandidatenstift, Berlin, 1865–1867, and preacher at St. Gertrude's in the same city 1867–77. Meanwhile, in 1864, he had become privatdocent for Old-Testament exegesis at the University of Berlin, where he was appointed associate professor of the same subject in 1868. Since 1877 he has been professor of Old-Testament exegesis and practical theology. He was made a consistorial counselor in 1873 and in 1894 was created a supreme consistorial counselor. In theology he is Evangelical, although he belongs to the critical school. He has written *Ueber das Buch Koheleth* (Berlin, 1864); *Augustin und Goethe's Faust* (1866); *Schillers religiöse Bedeutung* (1866); the commentary on Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah in J. P. Lange's *Bibelwerk* (Bielefeld, 1869; Eng. transl., New York, 1874); *Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Rechts- und Literaturgeschichte* (1872); *Abriss der Einleitung zum Alten Testamente in Tabellenform* (Berlin, 1878); *Die revidierte Lutherbibel* (Heidelberg, 1883); *Zur christlichen Kultur und Kulturgeschichte* (Berlin, 1889); *Der preussische Agenden-Entwurf* (Gotha, 1894); *Selbstgespräche am Kranken- und Sterbelager* (Berlin, 1896); *Die Profeten Israels in socialer Beziehung* (Leipsic, 1905); *Homiletik* (1907); and *Musik und Religion, Gottesdienst und Volksfeier* (1908).

KLEUKER, klei′ker, **JOHANN FRIEDRICH:** German Protestant apologete; b. at Osterode (41 m. s.s.e. of Hanover) Oct. 24, 1749; d. at Kiel May 31, 1827. He studied philosophy and theology at Göttingen, where he distinguished himself by his restless energy and capacity for work. As private tutor at Bückeburg he formed a friendship with Herder, through whose influence he was appointed prorector at Lemgo. This post he exchanged for a gymnasial rectorship at Osnabrück in 1778. During the last twenty-eight years of his life he was professor of theology at Kiel. He was a stanch adversary of the rationalism of the time and a prominent representative of a theosophical-Biblical supernaturalism on a historical basis. His theology was distinctly Christocentric. He regarded Christianity as the highest revelation of God, to teach man the nature of the highest good, the kingdom of God, and to enable him to participate in its realization. His numerous works attest not only his industry, but also his sound scholarship, especially in Oriental languages, patristic, and classical literature. They include: *Menschlicher Versuch über den Sohn Gottes und der Menschen* (Leipsic, 1776); *Johannes, Petrus und Paulus als Christologen betrachtet* (Riga, 1785); *Salomonische Denkwürdigkeiten* (1785); *Neue Prüfung und Erklärung der vorzüglichsten Beweise für die Wahrheit des Christenthums* (3 parts, 1787–94); *Ausführliche Untersuchung der Gründe für die Aechtheit und Glaubwürdigkeit der schriftlichen Urkunden des Christenthums* (5 parts, Leipsic, 1793–99); and *Grundriss einer Encyclopädie der Theologie* (2 parts, Hamburg, 1800–01).

(F. Arnold.)

Bibliography: H. Ratjen, *Johann Friedrich Kleuker und Briefe an seine Freunde*, Göttingen, 1882; C. E. Carstens, *Geschichte der theologischen Fakultät zu Kiel*, 1875; Volbehr, *Professoren und Docenten der Christian-Albrechts Universität zu Kiel*, Kiel, 1887.

Life.

KLIEFOTH, klî′fōth, **THEODOR FRIEDRICH DETHLOF:** German Lutheran; b. at Körchow near Wittenburg (17 m. s.w. of Schwerin), Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Jan. 18, 1810; d. at Schwerin Jan. 26, 1895. He was educated at the gymnasium of Schwerin, and at the Universities of Berlin and Rostock. In 1833 he was appointed instructor of Duke William of Mecklenburg, and in 1837 accompanied Grand Duke Frederick Francis as tutor to Dresden. He became pastor at Ludwigslust in 1840, and superintendent of Schwerin in 1844. Since 1835 he had been the leading spirit in the ecclesiastical and theological affairs of his state. With the abolishment of the old constitution of the estates in 1848 and the organization of a parliamentary government, the rule of the Church by the State had become an impossibility. Thus there originated in 1850 a superior ecclesiastical court with Kliefoth as chief ecclesiastical councilor. In 1886 he became its president. During the decades 1850–70, he was actively engaged in ecclesiastical reforms. Being convinced that the prosperity of the Church is principally dependent upon the efficiency of the administrators of the means of grace, he was intent upon filling the clergy with the spirit and doctrines of the Lutheran Church. To this end the faculty of Rostock was reorganized with teachers of strictly Lutheran tendency, the institution of church inspections by superintendents was again called into life, abuses in the church service and in the administration of ecclesiastical acts were abolished, and the rationalistic spirit was removed from the pulpit. New formularies of liturgy on the basis of the old church orders were made, and the old treasures of Lutheran church music were embodied in a new book of melodies.

His Views of the Church and Church Polity.

Kliefoth laid down his conception of the Church and church polity in his *Acht Bücher von der Kirche* (vol. i., Schwerin, 1854). The first four books treat of the kingdom of God founding of the Church, of the means of grace, of the congregation and its service, and of the Church and its order and government. The last four books, which were to treat of the development and completion of the Church never appeared. Kliefoth's peculiar conception was due chiefly to his occupation with the old Lutheran church orders. With great energy he emphasizes the divine foundation of the Church through the acts of salvation of the triune God; its divine basis in the means of grace, which mediate and vouchsafe the continuous effect of Christ and his spirit; the divine institution of the office of the means of grace; and the necessity of the organization and incorporation of the Church in church order and church government. The Church is for him the empirical congregation of the called, and not merely the congregation of true believers; and for him Lutheranism is not merely a doctrine or dogmatical tendency, but a distinctive church body whose peculiar historical development is to be perpetuated. He opposed the territorialism of state omnipotence, which denied the independence of the Church, the collegialism of modern representative church government, which originated in the Reformed Church and seemed to him to endanger the privilege and authority of the office of the means of grace; unionism, which threatened to absorb the Lutheran Church as such, or at least its confession; and the amalgamation of Church and politics, with its tendency toward the establishment of a national German Evangelical Church. On the other hand he aimed at the restoration of the Lutheran state churches and the strengthening of Lutheranism through a closer union. In this sense he represented the government of the Mecklenburg church at the Eisenach Conference after 1852; and in 1868 he founded with others the *Allgemeine evangelisch-lutherische Konferenz.*

Kliefoth was one of the strongest men among the churchmen and theologians of his day, and one of the most effective preachers of the nineteenth century. The political and ecclesiastical liberals decried him as a dangerous reactionist, the unionists hated his strict Lutheranism, the representatives of pietistic subjectivism were offended by his ecclesiasticism, and popular sentiment disliked his hierarchical tendencies. He was also the most notable authority of his time on liturgics and the old Lutheran church orders. His *Liturgische Abhandlungen* (8 vols., Schwerin, 1854–61, 2d. ed., 1858–69) is his most prominent work, the most peculiar expression of his spirit. Other important works are: *Einleitung in die Dogmengeschichte* (Ludwigslust, 1839); *Theorie des Kultus der evangelischen Kirche* (1844); *Ueber Predigt und Katechese in der Vergangenheit und in der Gegenwart* (in *Mecklenburgisches Kirchenblatt,* ii. 1–55, 169–245, Rostock, 1846); *Die ursprüngliche Gottesdienstordnung in den deutschen Kirchen lutherischen Bekenntnisses* (Rostock, 1847); *Das Verhältnis der Landesherren als Inhaber der Kirchengewalt zu ihren Kirchenbehörden* (Schwerin, 1861); *Der preussische Staat und die Kirchen* (1873); and *Christliche Eschatologie* (Leipsic, 1886). He also wrote commentaries on Zechariah (Schwerin, 1859), Ezekiel (2 parts, Rostock, 1864–65), Daniel (Schwerin, 1868), and Revelation (Leipsic, 1874). With Prof. O. Mejer of Rostock he edited the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (Schwerin, 1854–59), which, with A. W. Dieckhoff, he continued as *Theologische Zeitschrift* (1860–64). He published several collections of sermons, and a great number of single and occasional sermons.

(Ernst Haack.)

Bibliography: *Allgemeine evangelisch-lutherische Kirchenzeitung,* 1883, no. 19, 1895, nos. 10–15; L. von Hirschfeld, *Friedrich Franz II. . . . und seine Vorgänger,* 2 vols., Leipsic, 1891; C. Meusel, *Kirchliches Handlexikon,* iv. 11–13, ib. 1894.

KLING, CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH: German Protestant; b. at Altdorf (11 m. s.w. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, Nov. 4, 1800; d. at Marbach (15 m. s. of Heilbronn), Württemberg, Mar. 8, 1862. He studied at Tübingen and Berlin, became pastor at Waiblingen in 1826, professor of theology at Marburg in 1832, at Bonn in 1842, pastor at Ebersbach in 1849, and dean of Marbach in 1851. He was a pupil of Schleiermacher and Neander. In his writings, as in his lectures, he was instructive, sound, and winning, and showed himself a man of fine discrimination and independent judgment. He edited the sermons of the Franciscan Bertholdt (*Bertholdt des Franciscaners Predigten,* Berlin, 1824), prepared for J. P. Lange's *Bibelwerk* the commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians (Eng. transl., in Schaff's edition of Lange's *Commentary* (N. T., vol. vi., New York, 1868). He also published a number of treatises in *TSK.*

KLOPSTOCK, kləp′stək, **FRIEDRICH GOTTLIEB.**

Early Life and Studies (§ 1).
Studies at Leipsic. Earlier Poetic Work (§ 2).
Life and Works after 1748 (§ 3).
His Influence and Importance (§ 4).

Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock, the great German religious poet, was born at Quedlinburg (31 m. s.w. of Magdeburg), Prussia, July 2, 1724; d. at Ham-

1. Early Life and Studies.

burg Mar. 14, 1803. He was descended from a family which for three generations had attained a fair measure of distinction in the law and the government service. When Friedrich was nine years old his father removed to Friedeburg in the county of Mansfeld where the boy revealed even then that profound love for nature which was to find expression in his poetry. At the age of thirteen he returned to Quedlinburg and began his studies at the gymnasium, with little enthusiasm and success, however. A free scholarship enabled him to enter, in 1739, the Schulpforte, the ancient Schola Portensis founded by the Elector Maurice of Saxony for the education of Protestant youth. This was the time of the great struggle between the classicists and the romanticists, between Gottsched and Bodmer, and young Klopstock fell easily under the sway of the "revolutionary" ideas of the Swiss school. It was in 1737 that Gottsched opened the conflict by his attack on Milton's *Paradise Lost* and Bodmer replied in the celebrated *Vom Wunderbaren in der Poesie* (1740) which Klopstock took as his guide in the study of the epic, going at the same time to Homer and Vergil for his models. For a time he was possessed with the desire of celebrating in epic form, the deeds of Henry the Fowler, liberator of Germany from the Hungarians, but it came to him after many sleepless nights that the Messiah was the worthiest subject for the pen of an epic writer, and the youthful poet then entered upon his life's task which was to take twenty-five years in the completion. He graduated from the Schulpforte in 1745, delivering a valedictory address which must be regarded as marking, with the work of Bodmer already mentioned, the opening of a new era in the history of German literature. Abandoning the standards of the spiritless verse-literature of the modern classicists, Klopstock sounded an appeal for a national epic in the spirit of the great epics of the ancient world. He called for a German epic literature without knowing that such a treasure of national lore was in existence. At a time when Vergil was generally set above Homer because the one was "refined" and the other "rude" the youthful Klopstock dared to reverse the order and to proclaim the Greek singer as the prince of poets.

2. Studies at Leipsic. Earlier Poetic Work.

In the autumn of 1745 Klopstock began the study of theology at Jena; but his disgust was speedily aroused by the rudeness of student life there, and in the spring of the following year he removed to Leipsic. Before his departure, however, he had written the first three cantos of the *Messias,* in prose form. At Leipsic he came into intimate association with Gärtner, Andreas Cramer, A. Schlegel, Rabener, Zachariä, Giseke, and Ebert, who, with others, formed a poetic circle whose productions were published in the *Bremer Beiträge* edited by Gärtner. Here in an atmosphere of culture and personal affection, Klopstock began the composition of odes on the Horatian model. From the year 1747 date the *Lehrling der Griechen, Wingolf Die Künftig Geliebte,* and from the following year, *Selmar und Selma, An Ebert, An Giseke, Petrarca und Laura,* and others. In 1746 he had selected the hexameter as the most suitable form for his epic, and after laboring for nearly two years on the recasting of his prose material into verse published the first three cantos of the *Messias* in the *Bremer Beiträge* in 1748. The effect produced on the popular mind was tremendous; in the national literature they opened a new line of development. Above the musical and empty verse jingle of the time the opening songs of the *Messias* towered incomparable, with their fervid religiosity and poetic fire cast in noble Homeric phrase forms. As Kleist said, so lofty and rich a style had been deemed impossible in Germany. Less enthusiastic natures were carried away by the exalted piety which now found expression in such full-mouthed utterance. In spite of much that was personal in the *Messias,* much that was historically and critically unwarranted, no one could deny its author the gift of poetic, soul-stirring, Christian inspiration.

3. Life and Works after 1748.

In 1748 Klopstock left Leipsic and took up the post of tutor in the house of a relative at Langensalza, where his duties gave him ample leisure for the pursuit of his poetic works. At the same time he was at work on the fourth and fifth cantos of the *Messias;* happy, it may be presumed, in the enjoyment of a vast popularity. Hostile critics, however, were not wanting; the orthodox clergy assailed his "bold fictions," while the followers of Gottsched found fault with the technique of the poem and the excessive sentimentality that characterizes it in parts. In the spring of 1750 Klopstock returned to Quedlinburg, but went soon after to Switzerland, where his *Messias* had achieved its greatest triumph. He remained in Zurich till the spring of 1751 when he went to Copenhagen at the invitation of Frederick V. whose minister, Bernstorff, was one of his warmest admirers. The recipient of a liberal pension, he could now devote himself to the completion of his great poem. In 1754 he married Margareta Moller, whom, three years earlier, he had met in Hamburg, and had subsequently sung under the name of Cidli, and with whom he lived happily till her death in 1758. From this period date many odes and the plays, *Der Tod Adams* (1757), *Salomo* (1764), and *Die Hermannsschlacht* (1769), the latter revealing his complete lack of the dramatic sense and all contributing, by their unrestrained sentimentality, to the deterioration of dramatic standards in Germany. Frederick V. died in 1766; Count Bernstorff soon after fell from power, and, retiring in 1770 to Hamburg, was followed by Klopstock who passed the remainder of his life in that city with the exception of the years 1774 and 1775, when the Margrave Charles Frederick of Baden summoned him to Carlsruhe. There, in spite of honors conferred upon him, the poet found conditions little to his taste. It was on his return to Hamburg that he met Goethe, but the acquaintance then formed soon came to an end. In 1774 there appeared *Die Gelehrtenrepublik* containing Klopstock's opinion on literary questions, conditions, and personalities of the times as well as his investigations in the history of the German language. This work fell far below expectations, as Goethe tells in the twelfth book of his *Dichtung und Wahrheit.* In 1779 there appeared the *Fragmente über Sprache und Dichtkunst* and in the following year the definitive edition of the *Messias.* Klopstock's last years were passed in a leisurely activity, devoted to the composition of odes and the preparation of an edition of his collected works. The outbreak of the French Revolution aroused his enthusiasm and he was honored with the citizenship of the French Republic, but the excesses of the later revolutionists were learned with horror and anger. In 1791 he married Frau von Winthem (née Dimpfri), a niece of his first wife. He had no children. Among his last productions are several epigrams directed against the Kantian philosophy.

4. His Influence and Importance.

It was Klopstock who, to quote Platen, gave new life to the German language and liberated it from the thraldom of the French. Poesy became the beautiful and noble expression of the artist's soul finding full satisfaction in the sincere formulation of the problems that beset it. This has been the main characteristic of German poetry since the time of Klopstock and only they have achieved and retained primacy who have remained faithful to it. Klopstock's joyous and enthusiastic nature found its most grateful expression in the national and sacred song. Whenever he wanders outside of these realms he falls beneath his own level. If the great period in German literature that followed him may be characterized as being marked by a successful assimilation of national poetic elements with foreign elements of ancient and modern times, Klopstock must be regarded as the one who ushered in this new era. The one quality that he possessed above his contemporaries was the element of Germanic patriotism which evinced itself in his life and thought. He is Germanic in the delight he takes in tales of heroic deeds and in nature, home, and love; Germanic above all in that passionate longing for salvation which is the great inheritance of the German people. His admiration of the heroic finds utterance in odes like *Kaiser Heinrich, Mein Vaterland, Hermann und Thusnelda, Heinrich der Vogler, Die beiden Musen, Die Königin Luise.* His love of nature speaks in the *Bardale, Zürichersee, Friedensburg, Rheinwein, Das Rosenband, Die tote Clarissa.* A mighty current of faith pulsates in such odes as *An Gott, Dem Erlöser, Der Erbarmer, Das grosse Hallelujah,* as well as in his magnificent hymn of the Resurrection. This confidence in the Savior reveals itself in the certain hope of a rising from the dead and of an eternal life, and Klopstock is the poet of the future life primarily. When Gervinus in his life characterises the *Messias* as " an unbroken succession of monstrous errors " he has overlooked this great fact. At the same time he has failed to recognize the essential weakness of the poem which consists in this, that an individual here attempts to create an epic where the necessary conditions and presuppositions are absent. A national epic can arise only on the basis of a common national life and the poet in this case becomes only the mouthpiece as is the case with the *Heliand.* A " poetic invention " such as Klopstock resorts to in his creation of a Christian mythology is fatal to the epic story from the very beginning, since the true epic poet finds his activity not in creation but in narration of traditional facts; as far as diction is concerned it must be the simple language of the people. Judged by these standards, the *Messias* as an epic is a failure. But on the other hand it must not be denied the merit of having disseminated throughout the European world, this joyous message of salvation free from all dogmatic and credal restrictions. Klopstock's most unsuccessful attempt was his recasting of the old hymns of the Church which, in their utter lack of sympathy for an objective world and a consciousness of nationality, proved ungrateful material for his talents. On the other hand what he excelled in was his knowledge of classical antiquity and especially of the poetry of the Greeks.

His works first appeared in Leipsic, 7 vols., 1798–1810, but not in complete form till 1844–45, 11 vols.; his correspondence appeared in 3 vols. at Stuttgart, 1839–40. There are numerous editions of all or part of his works; e.g. *Oden* (Stuttgart, 1889; Eng. transl., London, 1848). Of *Messias,* on which his fame rests, an Eng. transl. appeared in 4 vols. at Hamburg, 1821–22. (A. Freybe.)

Bibliography: C. F. Cramer, *Klopstock,* 2 vols., Hamburg, 1777–78; idem, *Klopstock, Er; und über ihn,* 5 vols., ib., 1780–92; J. M. H. Döring, *Klopstocks Leben,* Weimar, 1825; J. W. Löbell, *Die Entwickelung der deutschen Poesie vor Klopstock's erstem Auftreten bis zu Goethes Tod,* 3 vols., Brunswick, 1856–65; R. Hamel, *Klopstockstudien,* Rostock, 1879–80; K. Heinemann, *Klopstocks Leben und Werke,* Bielefeld, 1890; F. Muncker, *Klopstock, Geschichte seines Lebens und seiner Schriften,* 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1900; Julian, *Hymnology,* pp. 625–626.

KLOSTERMANN, AUGUST HEINRICH: German Protestant; b. at Steinhude (15 m. w.n.w. of Hanover) May 16, 1837. He studied in Erlangen and Berlin 1855–58, and was assistant pastor in Bückeburg until 1864. From 1864 to 1868 he was tutor and privat-docent at Göttingen, and since 1868 has been professor of Old-Testament exegesis in Kiel. He has written: *Vindicæ Lucanæ* (Göttingen, 1866); *Das Markusevangelium nach seinem Quellenwerte für die evangelische Geschichte* (1867); *Untersuchung zur alttestamentlichen Theologie* (Gotha, 1868); *Korrekturen zur bisherigen Erklärung des Römerbriefes* (1881); *Die Gemütsstimmungen der Christen in Römer v. 1–11* (Kiel, 1881); *Ueber deutsche Art bei Martin Luther* (1884); *Die Gottesfurcht als Hauptstück der Weisheit* (1885); *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige ausgelegt* (Nördlingen, 1887); *Zur Theorie der biblischen Weissagung und zur Charakteristik des Hebräerbriefes* (1889); *Der Pentateuch, Beiträge zu seinem Verständnis und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte* (Leipsic, 1893); *Deuterojesaia, hebräisch und deutsch* (Munich, 1893); *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis zur Restauration unter Esra und Nehemia* (1896); *Ein diplomatischer Briefwechsel aus dem zweiten Jahrtausend vor Christo* (Kiel, 1898); *Deuteronomium und Grágás* (1900); and *Schulwesen im alten Israel,* (Leipsic, 1908).

KLOSTERMANN, klos'ter-man, **ERICH:** German Protestant; b. at Kiel Feb. 14, 1870. He studied at the academy of Neuchâtel and the universities of Leipsic, Kiel, Berlin, and Erlangen (Ph.D., Kiel, 1892). In 1901 he became privat-docent for New-Testament exegesis and early Christian literature in Kiel, where he was appointed full professor in 1905. He has written *De libri Coheleth versione Alexandrina* (Kiel, 1892); *Griechische Exzerpte aus Homilien des Origenes* (Leipsic, 1894); *Analekta zur Septuaginta, Hexapla und Patristik* (1895); *Die Schriften des Origenes und Hieronymus Brief an Paula* (Berlin, 1897); *Ueberlieferung der Jeremiashomilie des Origenes* (Leipsic, 1897); *Eusebius' Schrift περὶ τῶν τοπικῶν ὀνομάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ δείᾳ γραφῇ* (1902); *Reste des Petrusevangeliums, der Petrusapokalypse und des Kerugma Petri* (Bonn, 1903); *Ueber des Didymus von Alexandrien In epistolas canonicas enarratio* (Leipsic, 1905); and commentary on Mark (Tübingen, 1907; in collaboration with H. Greasmann).

KNAPP, ALBERT: The most distinguished German writer of spiritual songs in the first half of the nineteenth century; b. at Tübingen July 25, 1798; d. at Stuttgart June 18, 1864. He was the son of a councilor of the superior court in Tübingen, and his boyhood was spent in the poetic and inspiring atmosphere of the Black Forest. He entered the seminary of Maulbronn in 1814, and from 1816 to 1820 studied at the Evangelical theological seminary in Tübingen, where he imbibed more poetry than theology and found the pranks of student life more to his taste than the supernaturalism of the time. In 1820 he was sent to Feuerbach as vicar, and later to Gaisberg, both villages near Stuttgart. In Gaisberg he met Ludwig Hofacker (q.v.) and under his influence Knapp's life became more serious and his convictions more Evangelical. In 1825 he was appointed deacon in Sulz-on-the-Neckar and in 1831 in Kirchheim, at the special request of Duchess Henrietta of Württemberg. In 1836 he became deacon at the Hospitalkirche in Stuttgart, then archdeacon at the Stiftskirche, and in 1845 pastor of St. Leonardskirche. He declined the office of rural dean and was not active in the Christian and charitable associations of the town, preferring to confine himself to parochial duties, by which he won many personal friends and the love of his congregation.

Knapp's character was eminently broad, strong, and natural, his motto being *Homo sum, nil humani a me alienum puto.* His mind was open to everything noble and sublime in art and nature. But this susceptibility was kept within the limits of a spiritual orthodoxy, and he attacked every philosophy and theology which attempted to shake or undermine the fundamentals of Christian truth, which was for him also the absolutely beautiful. He was averse to all extremes, to those of orthodoxy as much as to the negative tendencies of the theologians, nor had he any sympathy with the one-sided views of sect. His standpoint was that of a pure Evangelical Christianity and a moderate confessionalism. He was not as powerful a preacher as Ludwig Hofacker, but his sermons are distinguished by a varied wealth and depth of thought expressed in vigorous language. His addresses to his fellow preachers at ministerial conferences were no less remarkable.

Knapp was an original poet and hymn-writer and his claim to permanent fame rests upon his gift for spiritual poetry. His collections of poems—*Christliche Gedichte* (2 vols., Basel, 1829); *Neuere Gedichte* (2 vols., 1834); *Christenlieder* (Stuttgart, 1841), a collection of hymns including forty-eight original; *Neueste Folge* (1843); *Auswahl* (1854, 1868); *Herbstblüten* (1859)—reveal his fertility, though some of them lack final finish. Nature and its glories furnish him inexhaustible material and inspiration, but he also treats facts of history and powerful personalities. In his *Christoterpe*, a Christian almanac and year-book, which he edited from 1833 to 1853, he celebrates poets like Goethe and Schiller, warriors like Napoleon, musicians like Bach, Handel, Mozart, and Beethoven, German heroes like the Hohenstauffens, classical antiquity, and modern history. He aimed to unite in his poems "transient nature and the fleeting life of man, and, raising itself above them both, the Word of God in its eternal youth." As far back as the twenties he conceived the idea of offering to the Christian public an *Evangelischer Liederschatz für Kirche und Haus.* From more than 80,000 hymns he selected 3,590 and published them at Stuttgart in 1837. He considered some changes of the text necessary, especially the removal of harsh expressions and grammatical faults; but he went further and took the liberty of "putting shallow and feeble expressions into a more vigorous, Biblical language and of filling up apparent gaps by new strophes and of freely reproducing whole songs." In single cases he succeeded brilliantly, but on the whole he had to confess in the second edition (1850) that he had been frequently guided too strongly by his subjective feelings. Even in this revised edition he did not properly reproduce the original, as he was still guided by the principle that the old hymns should be adapted to modern taste. The same may be said of the third edition (1865). The work received bitter criticism from G. C. H. Stip in his *Hymnologische Reisebriefe* (Berlin, 1852) and from Philipp Wackernagel in the *Kirchentag* at Bremen in the same year. A collection of Knapp's prose works appeared under the title *Gesammelte prosäische Schriften* (2 parts, Stuttgart, 1875). It consists chiefly of biographies of men like Ludwig Hofacker, Dann. Flatt, Eberhard Wörner, Hedinger, Zinzendorf, and others. Here the poet perceived many traits of character and motives of life which would be lost to the ordinary eye.

(Richard Lauxmann†.)

Bibliography: A *Lebensbild*, begun by himself and finished by his son, J. Knapp, appeared Stuttgart, 1867. Brief sketches are by K. Gerok, ib. 1879, and O. Brüssan, Hamburg, 1902; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 627–628.

KNAPP, knāp, GEORG CHRISTIAN: German Protestant; b. at Glaucha, Halle, Sept. 17, 1753; d. at Halle Oct. 14, 1825. He was the son of the pietist Johann Georg Knapp, and was one of the last exponents of Pietism in Halle. After studying at the universities of Halle and Göttingen he became extraordinary professor of theology at Halle in 1777 and full professor in 1782. In 1785 he assumed, with A. H. Niemeyer, the direction of the Francke foundations, comprising the orphan-house, the Latin school, and the Bible and Missionary Institute. In spite of failing health he administered his laborious offices for more than four decades with great fidelity and success. Though diffident and reserved, Knapp was a popular teacher, and his lectures on the Old and New Testaments, as well as on Christian doctrine, were largely attended. When Tholuck visited him toward the close of his life, he produced a bundle of letters from former students, remarking, "Here is my comfort, in the letters of those in whom the scattered seed first began to spring up during their professional experiences." As a writer Knapp turned mainly to exegesis. His principal works are a translation of the Psalms, with notes (Halle, 1776; 3d ed., 1789); an excellent edition of the New Testament (1797; 5th ed., 1840); and the collection of treatises, *Scripta, varii argumenti maximam partem exegetici atque historici* (2 vols., 1805; 2d ed., 1824). Posthumous were *Vorlesungen über die Christliche Glaubenslehre* (ed. K. Thilo, 2 parts, 1827; Eng. transl., *Lectures on Christian Theology*, 2 vols., New York, 1831–1833); and *Biblische Glaubenslehre vornehmlich zum praktischen Gebrauch* (ed. E. F. Guerike, Halle, 1840); and *Beiträge zur Lebensgeschichte August Gottlieb Spangenbergs* (ed. O. Frick, 1884). Mention may be made of two popular anonymous tracts, *Was soll ich thun, dass ich selig werde?* (1806); and *Anleitung zu einem gottseligen Leben* (1811). In collaboration with I. L. Schulze and A. H. Niemeyer he edited the review, *Frankens Stiftungen* (3 vols., Halle, 1792–96). In this he published, among other things, *Spener's Leben, Verdienste und Streitigkeiten* (vol. i., pp. 79–114); *Speners und Frankens Klagen über die Mängel der Religionslehrer* (vol. ii., pp. 33–84, 161–220); and *Johann Anastasius Freylinghausen* (vol. ii., pp. 305–333). Knapp collaborated in the *Beschreibung des Halleschen Waisenhauses* (Halle, 1799), and also edited *Missionsberichte* (Halle, 1799–1824).

(GEORG MÜLLER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. Tschackert, in *ADB*, xvi. 266–267; H. Holtzmann and R. Zöpffel, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirchenwesen*, p. 600. Brunswick, 1888; F. Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, iii. 1910–11, Paris, 1903.

KNEELAND, ABNER: American editor and deistic writer; b. at Gardner, Mass., Apr. 6, 1774; d. at Farmington, Ia., Aug. 27, 1844. He was first a Baptist, then a Universalist minister, but ultimately became a deist. After editing universalist periodicals in Philadelphia and New York, he went to Boston and founded there in 1831 the *Investigator*. For views expressed in this paper he was tried for blasphemy before the supreme court at Boston in 1836 and sentenced to imprisonment for a short time. His works include: *The New Testament in Greek and English* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1822); *Lectures on the Doctrine of Universal Salvation* (1824); and *A Review of the Evidences of Christianity* (New York, 1829).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The trial is reviewed in his own *Review of the Trial, Conviction and Final Imprisonment . . . of A. Kneeland*, Boston, 1838; C. G. Greene, *Read and Judge*, ib. 1834; S. D. Parker, *Report of the Arguments of the Attorney . . . at the Trials of A. Kneeland*, ib. 1834; Cosmopolite, *Review of the Prosecution against A. Kneeland*, ib. 1853.

KNEELING. See WORSHIP.

KNEELING CONTROVERSY IN BAVARIA: An incident of Bavarian ecclesiastical politics under the ministry of Karl von Abel between 1838 and 1845. King Ludwig I. (1825–48), an arbitrary ruler, particularly in the later years of his reign, longed for the restoration of the old glory of the Roman Church, and appointed Abel, an outspoken Roman Catholic reactionary, minister for the interior. As such he aimed blow after blow at the Protestants. On Aug. 14, 1838, an order of the war department required all soldiers, regardless of confession, to kneel in the mass and likewise if they happened to be on guard duty when the host was carried by in the Corpus Christi procession. Numerous petitions for the revocation of the order were sent to the supreme consistory and the council of state, but proved fruitless, Abel persuading the king that plots of the liberal opposition were concealed in all Protestant complaints. The consistory remained silent till 1843, but then, incited by the increasing arrogance of Abel and the determined resistance of the Protestants, they represented that the act required of the latter was for them a sin. An attempt was made to annul the order by legislative action but failed. Even J. J. I. von Döllinger defended it, claiming that kneeling was, for the Protestant soldier, merely a motion of the body having nothing to do with faith and conscience, and a vehement literary controversy was carried on between G. C. A. von Harless (q.v.) and other Protestants and Roman Catholic theologians. The first modification of the offensive order exempted Protestant soldiers from attending Roman Catholic services, and in Dec., 1848, its more objectionable requirements were annulled by the personal intervention of the king, who finally listened to other counselors than Abel and learned the true import of the opposition and its serious character. Abel's administration was overthrown in 1847. The entire movement benefited the Protestant Church more than it advanced the Roman.

(E. DORN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. Dorn, in *Beiträge zur bayerischen Kirchengeschichte*, v., parts 1–2, Erlangen, 1899; K. Fuchs, *Annalen der protestantischen Kirche in . . . Bayern*, Munich, 1839; G. Eilers, *Betrachtungen und Urtheile des . . . E. L. von Asters über die . . . Parteibewegungen unseres Jahrhunderts*, Saarbrücken, 1859; G. Thomasius, *Das Wiedererwachen des evangelischen Lebens in der lutherischen Kirche Bayerns*, Erlangen, 1867.

KNEUCKER, kneik′er, **JOHANN JAKOB:** German Protestant; b. at Tauberbischofsheim (19 m. s.w. of Würzburg) Feb. 12, 1840. He studied in Heidelberg, 1861–65, where he became privatdocent in 1873. In 1880 he was appointed associate professor of Old-Testament exegesis and Semitic languages in Heidelberg. He was also engaged in pastoral work from 1865 to 1904, holding the pastorate of Eppelheim, near Heidelberg, for the last twenty-one years of this period. In theology he belongs to the critical school, and besides editing F. Hitzig's *Vorlesungen über biblische Theologie und messianische Weissagungen des Alten Testaments* (Carlsruhe, 1880), has written *Siloah, Quell, Teich*

und Tal in Jerusalem (Heidelberg, 1873); *Das Buch Baruch* (Leipsic, 1879); *Die Anfänge des römischen Christentums* (Karlsruhe, 1881); *Unglaube oder Glaube?* (Heidelberg, 1895); and *Die Gleichberechtigung des kirchlichen Liberalismus mit der kirchlichen Rechtgläubigkeit im Lichte des biblischen Christentums, der reformatorischen Grundsätze und des badischen Bekenntnisstandes* (1898).

KNIGHT, ALBION WILLIAMSON: Protestant Episcopal bishop; b. at White Springs, Fla., Aug. 24, 1859. He studied at the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., but on account of illness took no degree. In 1881 he was ordered deacon, was ordained priest in 1883, and, after being a missionary in southern Florida 1881–83, held parishes at Palatka, Fla., 1884–86, and Jacksonville, Fla., 1886–93. He was dean of the cathedral at Atlanta, Ga., 1893–1904, and was consecrated bishop of Cuba in 1904.

KNIGHT, GEORGE THOMSON: Universalist; b. at Windham, Me., Oct. 29, 1850. He was educated at Tufts College (B.A., 1872; M.A., 1875) and at the Tufts Divinity School (B.D., 1875), and has taught in the latter institution since 1875, as instructor in rhetoric and church history 1875–83, as professor of church history 1883–1901, and as professor of Christian theology since 1901. He is also secretary and librarian of the Universalist Historical Society. He has published: *The Goodness of God* (Boston, 1904); and *The Praise of Hypocrisy* (Chicago, 1906).

KNIGHT, WILLIAM ALLEN: Congregationalist; b. at Milton, Miss., Oct. 20, 1863. He studied at Adalbert College, Western Reserve University, Hiram College, Hiram, O. (B.A., 1889), Oberlin Theological Seminary, from which he was graduated in 1900, and Harvard University (1903–05). He was associate pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Cleveland, O., 1891–94, and became pastor of the First Congregational Church, Saginaw, Mich., in 1894, of the Central Congregational Church, Fall River, Mass., in 1897, and of the Brighton Congregational Church, Boston, in 1902. In theology he belongs to the liberal school, and has written: *The Song of our Syrian Guest* (Boston, 1903); *The Love Watch* (1904); *Saint Abigail of the Pines* (1905); *The Tryst by the Sea* (1905); and *Signs in the Christmas Fire* (1908).

KNIPPERDOLLING (KNIPPERDOLLINCK), BERNT: German Anabaptist; born in Münster; executed there Jan. 23, 1536. He came of a respected family and was himself a merchant; he became involved in the riot of 1527 at Münster and was imprisoned by the bishop, but by a fine secured his release. He adopted the faith of the Anabaptists, sheltered some of the leaders in his house, and was after the victory of the faction made bürgermeister. He aided in the placing of John of Leyden at the head of affairs at Münster (see MÜNSTER, ANABAPTISTS IN), and became sword-bearer and then governor; but when the city was retaken, he was captured and put to death.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult the literature under MÜNSTER, ANABAPTISTS IN.

KNIPSTRO, knîp′stro, JOHANNES: German theologian and one of the founders of the Protestant church in Pomerania; b. at Sandau (49 m. n.n.e. of Magdeburg) May 1, 1497; d. at Wolgast (33 m. s.e. of Stralsund) Oct. 4, 1556. Little is known regarding his early life, but in 1516 he went from a Franciscan cloister in Silesia to a Minorite convent at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, probably for the prosecution of his studies there. A legend dating from the end of the seventeenth century describes Knipstro as meeting and overcoming the celebrated Tetzel in a public debate on indulgences in Jan., 1518, but earlier sources contain nothing to support this tradition. It is more correct to say that Knipstro embraced the teachings of Luther at an early age, and that about the year 1521 he began to preach the new doctrines publicly at Pyritz, whither he had been transferred in the hope of counteracting his heretical tendencies. Erasmus of Manteuffel, bishop of Cammin, ordered the arrest of Knipstro, who succeeded in making his escape to Stettin and was a preacher in Stralsund in Nov., 1525. There he remained till 1531, taking an important part in the organization of the church system and acting as a zealous supporter of the Lutheran doctrine against the principles of Zwinglianism which found favor among some of his colleagues. After two years' sojourn in Greifswald Knipstro returned to Stralsund, where he rose to a position of eminence, and continually endeavored to impress conservative Lutheranism on the religious life of the city. He represented Stralsund in the important religious assembly of the Hansa towns which met at Hamburg in 1535, and subsequently became court preacher to Duke Philip of Pomerania-Wolgast. When the country was divided into the three sees of Wolgast, Stettin, and Stolp, Knipstro was appointed general superintendent of the first diocese, displaying in the performance of his office an active zeal for the improvement of discipline and the moral uplifting of the clergy. From 1539 to 1541 he was professor of theology at the new University of Greifswald, and though he held no academic degree, he continued uninterruptedly to fill this position after 1543, resigning his pastorate in Wolgast. In 1552, however, he left Greifswald and returned to his parish. Together with Paul von Rode, he drew up, in 1542, a new constitution for the church which was adopted by the provincial synods. Toward the Interim Knipstro maintained an attitude of politic compromise in deference to the wishes of Duke Philip, who nominally accepted it for his dominions and made his peace with the emperor. In the Osiandrian controversy which broke out soon after, Knipstro, as an opponent of Osiander, entered into controversy with Petrus Artopöus of Stettin, and published, in accordance with the instructions of the synod, his *Antwort der Theologen und Pastoren in Pommern auf die Confession A. Osiandri* (Wittenberg, 1552). The dispute lasted several years and resulted in the deposition of Artopöus.

Of far greater importance was the contest which Knipstro carried on against Johann Freder over the question of ordination, a controversy in which political and doctrinal interests were closely intermingled. Freder, who was a brother-in-law of Justus Jonas, had been summoned from a tutorial position to the post of preacher in the Hamburg cathedral in 1540, but had not been inducted with the laying on of hands on account of the opposition of the Roman Catholic canons. In 1547 he became superintendent at Stralsund and accordingly exercised the powers of examination and ordination over the city clergy. Knipstro now demanded that Freder should receive ordination at his hands, an act which would have been an official recognition of the authority of the general superintendency of Wolgast over Stralsund. The authorities of Stralsund forbade Freder to submit to such ordination, and in 1549 the dispute was interrupted for a time by the dismissal of Freder on account of his opposition to the Interim. In 1549 Freder became professor of theology at Greifswald, and in 1550 superintendent at Rügen, then part of the ecclesiastical province of the Danish bishop of Roeskilde, who had the power of confirmation. To nullify this authority Knipstro introduced Freder into office at Rügen without waiting for the confirmation of Bishop Palladius of Roeskilde, who now required Freder to appear in Copenhagen. Philip, however, forbade him to make the journey, whereupon Knipstro entered into a sharp controversy with Freder, denying the power of ordination to one who had not himself been ordained. Freder in reply denied that the imposition of hands constituted an essential part of ordination, and appealed to the Wittenberg theologians, who declared, through Melanchthon and Bugenhagen, that the custom of imposition as a praiseworthy practise was derived from old apostolic times and that it should not be abandoned, although one might be considered duly ordained who had not observed it. In 1551 Freder was ordained by Palladius in Denmark, and though he was deprived of his professorship at Greifswald he still remained superintendent at Rügen and in 1553 came to an agreement with Knipstro. The contest, however, was speedily renewed, and as Freder assumed a radical position in defiance of a decision of the synod of Greifswald, he was compelled to leave Rügen and became superintendent at Wismar. Knipstro, who had thus vindicated the authority of the ruling powers against that of a foreign bishop, continued in the active exercise of his duties for the remainder of his life. (G. Kawerau.)

Bibliography: J. Runge (d. 1595), *Brevis designatio*, partly printed in J. G. L. Kosegarten, *De academia Pomerana*, pp. 26 sqq., Greifswald, 1839; J. F. Mayer, *Synodologia Pomeranica*, ib. 1703; F. Bahlow, *Johannes Knipstro*, Halle, 1898. Consult also: O. Fock, *Rügensch-Pommersche Geschichten*, v. 217 sqq., Leipsic, 1868; G. Rietschel, *Luther und die Ordination*, pp. 90 sqq., Wittenberg, 1889.

KNOBEL, AUGUST WILHELM: German Protestant exegete; b. at Tzschecheln near Sorau (55 m. s.s.e. of Frankfort-on-the-Oder), Lower Lusatia, Aug. 7, 1807; d. at Giessen May 25, 1863. He studied at the gymnasium of Sorau and at the University of Breslau (Ph.D., 1831; Th.D., 1838), where he became privat-docent in 1831 and professor extraordinary of theology in 1835. His *Prophetismus der Hebräer* (2 vols., Breslau, 1837) secured him a professorship in theology at Giessen in 1839. At Giessen he lectured exclusively on the Old Testament. His lectures were of great value from the linguistic, historical, and archeological side, though the decidedly rationalistic bent of his mind prevented him from thoroughly appreciating the poetical and theological value of the Old Testament. His works are distinguished by sober-mindedness and discretion, by sound linguistic and historical views, and by a comprehensive knowledge of Oriental antiquity. With the exception of the abovementioned work and *Völkertafel der Genesis* (Giessen, 1850), he published exclusively exegetical works; viz., commentaries on Isaiah (Leipsic, 1843; 3d ed. 1861), which involved him in a controversy with Ewald, and occasioned him to write his *Exegetisches Vademecum für Herrn Ewald in Tübingen* (Giessen, 1844); Genesis (Leipsic, 1852; 2d ed. 1860); Exodus and Leviticus (1857); and Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua (1861). They all appeared in L. Hirzel's *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament*, and with the contributions of Otto Thenius and Ernst Bertheau, form the most valuable part of that collection. Knobel also wrote a commentary on Ecclesiastes (Leipsic, 1836). (O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: H. E. Scriba, *Biographisch-literärisches Lexikon*, ii. 387, Darmstadt, 1843; C. Meusel, *Kirchliches Handlexikon*, iv. 23, Leipsic, 1894; *ADB*, xvi. 300–304.

KNOEPFLER, knʊp′fler, **ALOIS:** German Roman Catholic; b. at Schomburg Aug. 29, 1847. He studied in Tübingen (Ph. D., 1873) and at the theological seminary at Rottenburg, and after being a lecturer at the Wilhelmstift, Tübingen, 1876–80, was teacher at the Realschule at Schramberg and professor in the Lyceum of Passau from 1880 to 1886. Since 1886 he has been professor of church history in the University of Munich, of which he was rector in 1893–94. Besides editing the fifth and sixth volumes of the second edition of C. J. von Hefele's *Conciliengeschichte* (Freiburg, 1886–90) and *Veröffentlichungen aus dem kirchengeschichtlichen Seminar München* (Munich, 1899 sqq.), to which he has contributed editions of Walafried Strabo's *Liber de exordiis et incrementis rerum ecclesiasticarum* (Munich, 1890) and Rabanus Maurus' *De institutione clericorum libri tres* (1900), he has written *Kelchbewegung in Bayern unter Albrecht V.* (Munich, 1891); *Wert und Bedeutung des Studiums der Kirchengeschichte* (1893); *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (Freiburg, 1895); *Johann Adam Möller* (Munich, 1896); and *Das Vaterunser im Geiste der Kirchenväter in Wort und Bild* (in collaboration with L. Glötzle; Freiburg, 1898).

KNOKE, knō′ke, **KARL:** German Lutheran; b. at Schmedenstedt (near Peine, 13 m. n.w. of Brunswick) Oct. 15, 1841. He studied in Göttingen and Erlangen, and was private tutor (1865–67), principal of a school at Walsrode (1867–69), teacher in the normal school at Alfeld (1869–75), and principal of a similar institution at Wunstorf, near Hanover (1875–82). Since 1882 he has been professor of practical theology in Göttingen. In 1904 he was made abbot of Bursfelde, and is also a consistorial councilor. He is the founder of the Evangelical Lutheran Association in the province of Hanover, and has written: *Zur Methodik der biblischen Geschichte, i.* (Hanover, 1875); *Der Christ und die politische Gepräge der Zeit* (1876); *Das erste Triennium des Schullehrerseminars zu*

Wunstorf (1877); *Ueber Katechismusunterricht* (1886); *Praktisch-theologischer Kommentar zu den Pastoralbriefen des Apostels Paulus* (2 vols., Göttingen, 1887–89); *Grundriss der praktischen Theologie* (1889); *Grundriss der Pädagogik und ihre Geschichte seit dem Zeitalter des Humanismus* (Berlin, 1894); *Zur Geschichte der biblischen Figur-Spruch-Bücher* (Gotha, 1899); and *Ausgabe des lutherischen Enchiridions bis zu Luthers Tode* (Stuttgart, 1903). He also edited the fourth edition of J. J. van Oosterzee's *Pastoralbriefe und der Brief an Philemon* (Bielefeld, 1894), and editions of T. Mancinus' *Die Passion Christi* (Göttingen, 1898) and Luther's smaller catechism (Halle, 1904).

KNOLLYS, nōlz, **HANSERD:** English Particular Baptist; b. at Cawkwell (20 m. e.n.e. of Lincoln), Lincolnshire, c. 1599; d. in London Sept. 19, 1691. He studied at Cambridge, took orders in 1629, and became vicar of Humberstone, Lincolnshire, but resigned his living in 1636, became a separatist and renounced his orders. The same year he was arrested on a warrant from the High Commission Court and imprisoned at Boston, Lincolnshire. Escaping through the connivance of his keeper he fled to New England early in 1638, and later in that year founded a church at Dover, N. H., over which he presided till his return to England in 1641. It is not known when, or where, he was baptized into the Baptist faith; but in 1645 he was ordained pastor of a Baptist congregation that he had gathered in London. He held several offices under Cromwell's government, and preached to large audiences without interference till the Restoration (1660). After an enforced absence of some three years in Germany he resumed his pastorate in London and preached there almost up to the day of his death. In 1670 he was arrested and imprisoned under the second Conventicle Act (q. v.), but was soon discharged. In 1689 he took a leading part in the movement to unite the Baptists. He wrote several books, including: *The Shining of a Flaming Fire in Zion* (London, 1646); *The Rudiments of the Hebrew Grammar in English* (1648); *Grammaticæ Latinæ, Græcæ et Hebraicæ Compendium* (1665); and his autobiography to the year 1672 (1692), which was completed by W. Kiffin. The Hanserd Knollys Society was organized in London in 1845 to republish early Baptist writings; it was dissolved after ten volumes had been issued.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *DNB*, xxxi. 279-281 gives a list of the scattering sources and accounts.

KNOPKEN, knɵp'ken (**KNOP, KNOPPE**), **ANDREAS, AND THE REFORMATION IN RIGA:** Andreas Knopken, the Reformer of Riga, was born, probably in a village near Küstrin (17 m. n.e. of Frankfort), possibly in 1493, and he died at Riga Feb. 18, 1539. In 1511 he was a student at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and shortly afterward went to Riga. Becoming discontented with his environment, he devoted himself anew to study, and accordingly went to Treptow, where, under the leadership of Bugenhagen, he soon acquired such proficiency in the Bible that he was appointed assistant to his teacher at the school in the same city. The teachers were under the influence of Lutheranism, and the new movement thus spread among the monks and clergy, and prepared the way for the Reformation among the laity. The measures taken by Erasmus Manteuffel, afterward bishop of Kammin, resulted in the closing of the school, but Knopken had already returned to Riga, together with a number of Livonian scholars, in 1521.

Even before his coming, however, the works of Luther were eagerly read in Livonia, and in ground which had been thus prepared Knopken, introduced by a letter of Melanchthon, actively implanted his propaganda. The number of his adherents increased continually, and to confirm them in their faith he lectured on the Epistle to the Romans (Wittenberg, 1524), laying his chief stress on the presentation of Evangelical doctrines, and especially on the cardinal dogma of justification, the position being that of the writings of Luther and Melanchthon between 1519 and 1521. He likewise polemized sharply against the Roman Catholic Church. To check this Protestant propaganda, Jasper Linde, archbishop of Riga, urged the grand master Plettenberg to take repressive measures against the Evangelicals, but the request was refused, and the grand master advised a disputation instead. The debate accordingly took place in the choir of St. Peter's on June 19, 1522, and was adjudged to be a victory for Knopken. Under such circumstances it became easy for the authorities to declare their allegiance to the Reformation, and after a letter addressed to the archbishop with a request for a reform of the Church and the appointment of Evangelical teachers had proved fruitless, the municipal council, aided by the elders of both gilds, elected Knopken archdeacon of St. Peter's, where he delivered his inaugural sermon Oct. 23, 1522. The protection of the authorities enabled him to officiate without fear of molestation, and he soon received assistants in his personal friend Joachim Möller and in Sylvester Tegetmeier. The denunciatory speeches of the latter, however, led to grave excesses on the part of the Protestants, and, though they were checked for a time, they broke out again in 1524. In this time of riot Tegetmeier had no part, for soon after the first commotion he had changed his course, and had so won the confidence of the authorities that he was soon invited to become the pastor of St. James, entering upon his duties there on the first Sunday in Advent, 1522. The number of Evangelical preachers in Riga steadily increased, while the efforts of the archbishop to induce the German government to suppress the movement were unsuccessful, and served only to incite the citizens of Riga to greater hostility. They refused allegiance to Linde's successor, Johann Blankenfeld, and the grand master was obliged, in accordance with the terms of his agreement with the Lutherans, to give them his protection. The archbishop was suspected of coquetting with the Russians and was arrested by the grand master, but regained his freedom by an ostensible submission and hastened to Livonia to complain to the emperor. He died on the way, however, and his successor, Thomas Schöning, desiring to regain his archiepiscopal rights and estates, granted the Lutherans their privileges and freedom.

In 1530 Knopken and Johann Briessmann (q. v.), who had been called from Königsberg three years previously, prepared a church order for Riga, basing it primarily on the Königsberg articles of 1525 and closely following Luther's *Formula missæ*. After the separation of the community from Roman Catholic control, the council took charge of the administration of ecclesiastical affairs, electing and calling pastors in cooperation with the gilds, and providing for the maintenance of the clergy, the churches, and the schools. Two members of the council, with the mayor as a "superintendent," formed a sort of consistory for the administration of external affairs after 1532, but the internal control remained in the hands of the chief clergy. The congregations were represented by their elders in the election of pastors and in the administration of the funds for the church and the poor. By the time of Knopken's death, the Reformation had been carried through in Riga, and in 1554 Evangelical preaching was officially proclaimed free from restrictions in all Livonia.

(F. Hörschelmann†.)

Bibliography: F. Hörschelmann, *Andreas Knopken, der Reformator Rigas*, Leipsic, 1896; T. Schiemann, *Die Reformation Alt-Livlands*, Hamburg, 1885.

KNOWLEDGE, THEOLOGICAL, PRINCIPLE OF.

Christ the Source of Theological Knowledge (§ 1).
Knowledge a Progression (§ 2).
The Biblical Christ (§ 3).
Summary (§ 4).

1. Christ the Source of Theological Knowledge.

In the early Protestant theology the entire Scripture was the basis of theological knowledge; in modern theology the historic Christ is regarded as the only source of knowledge of God and things divine. It is admitted that God makes himself known by inner workings in the spirit, but it is claimed that real, that is, clear, certain, and general knowledge flows only from that medium through which the subjective experiences of Christians are conveyed, from the Christ of tradition. Nature and extra-Christian history are considered as sources which, without Christ, are ambiguous and enigmatical. Even the practical reason can give only a religion of morality, and not a sin-forgiving grace.

If it be asked what is there in Christ that gives knowledge of God and things divine, the answer must be, his faith in them and his communion with God, his self-consciousness and his moral character as it influences the world. The primitive Christian tradition concerning the words of Jesus and His deeds, by which His inmost being is made known, is dominated by faith in the infinite value of his death, in his resurrection and exaltation to lordship over the world, and in his return to earth. Moreover, inasmuch as the inner life of Jesus, his spirit, i.e., his faith and moral character, became to a certain extent the common spirit of the congregation of his disciples during their intercourse with him, the primitive Christian knowledge of God himself, of divine things, and of moral relationship must to some extent be regarded, in general, as the influence of the earthly Christ. The Holy Spirit, who spoke and speaks out of the oral and written preaching of the primitive Christians, can not be regarded as a new and second principle of the knowledge of God. For if we, like them, by no means conceive our religious and moral knowledge as a mere after-effect of the earthly Christ, we nevertheless do regard it as an effect of Christ himself—of the exalted Christ. "The historic Christ, the only principle of divine knowledge," means for us also the Christ who manifests himself from heaven as the risen one, thus converting a Saul, and now delaying his return. The Lutheran view, that inspirations are bound to external media, from which the real knowledge flows, is true also of primitive Christianity: the matters of common knowledge proceed from the pneumatic manifestations of the exalted Christ and from the tradition of the pneumatic life of the earthly Christ. We may abide by the interpretation of John xvi. 12–15, which declares that the Spirit only glorifies the sole exegete of God (John i. 18) by teaching how he may be more and more perfectly known.

2. Knowledge a Progression.

But did the human race have a finished knowledge of its Redeemer by the time the apostles died? There was no want of great men after this, who were able, under the influence of new historic manifestations, to discover here and there some unhewn stones in the Evangelical tradition; Athanasius, Augustine, Luther may be named. Though they have not in the least surpassed the apostolic knowledge of Christ, they none the less have deepened the understanding of the apostles and their knowledge of him. The effects of the impersonal spirit of Jesus, of the spirit, originating from him, in the first primitive Christian Church as a whole, and of the spiritual factors at work in several individual cases in the days of primitive Christianity, unfold themselves in the whole history of the Church. The progress of secular science does not embarrass Jesus himself, who wished to be neither a naturalist nor a historian. We ought to permit ourselves no doubt concerning the fact, that it is not simply from a development within the Church that we have learned to separate the temporary husks from the divine, infallible spirit of Christ. If we believe that the living Christ dominates the whole history of thought, we can say that he interprets himself, the earthly Jesus, by means also of events and advances in knowledge that take place out of the sphere of church history; he spoke not only through the destruction of Jerusalem, but also through the destruction of the ancient conception of the world. The field in which Jesus sowed his word was time, his time, the future times. His spirit was not of time but of eternity; his word a germ which makes its full content and its peculiar character known only in the course of the historical development. Christ in the inmost content of his spiritual being was more than he could manifest (Schleiermacher, *Der christliche Glaube*, § 93, 2). It is only in the entire course of the historical development of the Church that he can be understood in his entirety.

That the apostolic beginning of the process, which bore its fruit in the establishment of the Church and in the New Testament, has for this

3. The Biblical Christ.

purpose a unique worth, goes without saying. The understanding of Christ made known in the New Testament bears so unique a relation to the unique working of the exalted Christ, that it is well, by means of the term, the "Biblical" Christ, to express the difference in intensity between his revealing activity in the apostolic age and that of the later periods. This term will differentiate the unique beginning of the post-terrestrial revealing activity of Christ from the later acts of revelation, and combine the former with his earthly work. This Biblical Christ is for us the historical Christ, the only principle for the knowledge of God. But the term "Biblical" Christ is not to denote that everything in primitive Christianity, everything apostolic, belongs to the eternal; not even all that is meant to glorify Christ. By this conception we merely wish "to suggest how important for all posterity, provided we believe at all in a real revelation of our God in our Lord, is the knowledge of Christ which the first witnesses had and which he himself as the Lord of the Spirit called forth in them" (Häring). But if nevertheless we differentiate in the primitive Christian conception of Christ the elements taken from the notions of the day and an eternal germ which grew out of the spirit of Christ, we must inquire what is to be recognized as such. Will the simple answer suffice: all taken from the history of that time is unessential, and only that which is unanimously received, which has developed from the spirit of Christ, is the essential, that is, that which truly reveals the eternal?

But, just as the answer, that the essential is the unanimously received, is for several reasons unsatisfactory, so also is the assertion that everything taken from the history of the time is unessential. Does the denial of an independent newness in the case of all the New-Testament views conditioned by the history of the time mean also the sacrifice of their value as revelations? For example, is the thought that Jesus had a personal preexistence condemned merely because it is conditioned by a Jewish formula? Baldensperger has declared that even for Jesus himself it was a formula that explained his own personality, which he experienced as a wondrous mystery. In this, too, consists his originality, to speak with Wellhausen, that he perceived the true and eternal in the mass of chaotic rubbish, rejected the incidental, the caricatured, the dead elements, and in the lens of his individuality gathered together that which has eternal worth, the human-divine. But may not such a gathering have been also the pneumatic achievement of the spirit of a Paul, or of primitive Christianity as a whole? In this way, e.g., the whole primitive Christian angelology could be stamped as revelation. Scientific theology will no longer raise question about that. But not only that which the earthly Jesus himself gathered as eternally valid out of the mass of New-Testament factors that are historically conditioned is to be received as imperishable, but also that which, without contradicting the spirit of Jesus has, under the pneumatic manifestations of the Exalted One, undergone a new development out of that gathered by him. Thus, e.g., we judge the thought of Paul's faith concerning the incarnation of Christ Jesus as an ethical act of self-denying love, by virtue of which he "entirely emerges from the bounds of Jewish speculations about the Messiah" (Pfleiderer), without antagonizing the humble spirit of Jesus. On the other hand, it is impossible to construe the whole angelology common to primitive Christianity as a development of Jesus' belief concerning angels, which was, compared with that, meager and super-Jewish.

4. Summary.

When we place restrictions upon the principle, "only that in the New Testament has value as a revelation which is not conditioned by the history of the time," we have, in the last analysis, to look back to the earthly from the exalted Christ who glorified himself in primitive Christianity. The two taken together make the Biblical, the historical Christ, the only principle for the knowledge of God and things divine. We conclude, then, that this is the pneumatic life of the earthly Christ and that which has logically unfolded itself therefrom in the primitive Christians under the influence of the pneumatic manifestations of the exalted Christ. This presupposes that the pneumatic life of the earthly Christ can be ascertained from the Evangelical tradition, in order that by this touchstone the primitive Christian preaching may be tested as to its consistency. In declaring that such testing is necessary one declares, by this very fact, that the earthly Jesus is the real foundation of the knowledge of God—but his resurrection must also be added—this alone, not also the proofs of it, viz., the appearances of the risen one, which belong to the exalted Christ. In Rom. i. 3–4, we find that which is fundamental in the principle of theological knowledge, by which both the Old Testament, mentioned in v. 2, as well as the preaching even of a Paul (v. 1, 5) must be tested; he is indeed, by virtue of an act of revelation by the Risen One, his greatest apostle, and yet no absolutely infallible lawgiver in matters of faith. Karl Thieme.

Bibliography: A. Ritschl, *Theologie und Metaphysik*, Bonn, 1887; J. Kaftan, in *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, i (1891), 479–549; M. Kähler, *Die Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre*, pp. 11 sqq., Leipsic, 1893; idem, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus*, ib. 1896; M. Reischle, *Der Glaube an Jesus Christus und die geschichtliche Erforschung seines Lebens*, Leipsic, 1893; idem, *Der Streit über die Begründung des Glaubens auf den "geschichtlichen" Jesus Christus*, in *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, vii (1897), 171–264; O. Ritschl, in *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, iii (1893), 371–426; W. Hermann, *Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott*, Stuttgart, 1896; P. Kölbing, *Die heilige Schrift als oberste Norm der christlichen Glaubenserkenntnis*, Gnadau, 1896; G. Ecke, *Die theologische Schule Albrecht Ritschls und die evangelische Kirche der Gegenwart*, Berlin, 1897.

KNOWLEDGE, THEORY OF RELIGIOUS. See Truth, Truthfulness, I.

KNOWLING, nōling, **RICHARD JOHN:** Church of England; b. at Devonport (2 m. w.n.w. of Plymouth), Devonshire, Sept. 16, 1851. He studied at Balliol College, Oxford (B.A., 1874), and was ordered deacon in 1875 and ordained priest in 1876. He was classical master in Abingdon Grammar

School 1874–76, and curate of Wellington, Somerset, 1876–78 and of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, London, 1878–84. He was then called to King's College, London, where he was successively censor and lecturer (1884–90), vice-principal (1890–1897), and professor of New-Testament exegesis (1894–1905). Since 1905 he has been canon of Durham and professor of divinity in Durham University, and fellow of King's College. He was examining chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of Exeter 1903–05 and examiner in the University of London 1905–06, besides being select preacher at Cambridge in 1895 and Boyle Lecturer in 1903–05. His theological position is conservative. He has written *The Witness of the Epistles, a Study in modern Criticism* (London, 1892); *Acts of the Apostles* in *The Expositor's Greek Testament* (1901); *Our Lord's Virgin Birth and the Criticism of To-day* (1903); *The Epistle of St. James* (1904); *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ* (Boyle Lectures for 1903–05; 1905); and *Literary Criticism and the New Testament* (1907).

KNOW-NOTHING MOVEMENT: A popular movement which had considerable influence in the United States in the middle of the nineteenth century, partly political, partly inspired by a not unnatural nervousness in view of the experience of all European countries with the meddling of the Roman Catholic Church in national politics and the fact that there was no official deliverance to show that it would not do the same in the United States. It was based on the theory that the republic would be in danger unless the Roman Catholic Church were held in check and foreign-born citizens, especially Roman Catholics, excluded from all share in the government. As the successor of various " native American " movements which had nursed similar beliefs even in colonial times, the Know-Nothing party (so called from the injunction laid upon its members to profess utter ignorance of even the existence of any such organization) was formally organized in 1852, when political conditions favored the launching of a new party which should attract the dissatisfied elements of the older ones. It was begun as a local organization in New York City, and at first aimed at local and municipal victories. As stated in its ritual after a national council had been formed, its objects were among other things " to resist the insidious policy of the Church of Rome and all other foreign influence against our republican institutions in all lawful ways " and " to place in all offices of honor, trust, or profit in the gift of the people or by appointment none but native-born Protestant citizens." These and other uncompromising declarations were for the initiated; a statement of principles was drawn up for the general public which professed to aim at " no interference with religious faith or worship and no test or oaths for office." After several successes in municipal elections, in 1854 the party sent forty representatives to Congress and elected a governor and legislature in Massachusetts. In the following year they carried the elections in nine States, and elected the governors of New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, while in the next Congress there were seventy-five Know-Nothing members elected as such. The inflammatory talk of the promoters of the movement produced its natural results. Riotous mobs assembled in various New England cities, and Roman Catholic churches were set on fire there and in New York, New Jersey, and Ohio. At least twenty persons were killed in Know-Nothing riots in Louisville, and attempts were made to assassinate Archbishop Bedini, nuncio in Brazil, who had been commissioned to examine various ecclesiastical matters on his passage through the United States. In 1856 the party held a national convention and nominated Millard Fillmore for president. The northern delegates, however, seceded from the convention on failing to secure a definite anti-slavery declaration, and Fillmore secured only the eight electoral votes of Maryland. From this time Know-Nothingism as a political movement may be said to have collapsed, although in 1860 Bell and Everett, candidates of the " Constitutional Union," received thirty-nine electoral votes largely through the support of Know-Nothing elements which had refused to merge in either of the two great parties. With the outbreak of the Civil War an opportunity was afforded to American citizens of foreign birth and Roman Catholic religion to demonstrate their loyalty to the land of their adoption; and the fact that no less than 150,000 men of Irish birth enlisted in the Union army proved that the laity of that church were not scheming against the government. The general decay of religious intolerance tended in the same direction—although in comparatively recent years, especially from 1891 to 1897, the " American Protective Association " has attracted some attention as representing substantially the same principles.

Bibliography: T. B. Whitney, *Defence of American Policy*, New York, 1856 (by an advocate); J. Kehoe, *Life and Writings of Archbishop Hughes*, ib. 1865; J. L. Spalding, *Life of Archbishop Spalding*, Baltimore, 1872; T. V. Cooper and H. T. Fenton, *American Policies*, Chicago, 1884 (containing the ritual); J. B. McMaster, *The Riotous Career of the Know-Nothings*, in *With the Fathers*, New York, 1896; L. F. Schmeckebier, *Hist. of the Know-Nothing Party in Maryland*, Baltimore, 1899; J. A. Woodburn, *Political Parties*, New York, 1903; T. J. Jenkins, in *Catholic World*, lvii (1893), 511–522; and the works on the history of the period.

KNOX, nox, **EDMUND ARBUTHNOTT:** Church of England, bishop of Manchester; b. at Bangalore, India, Dec. 6, 1847. He studied at Christ Church, Oxford (B.A., 1869), and was ordered deacon in 1870 and ordained priest in 1872. From 1868 to 1885 he was fellow of Merton College, Oxford, where he was tutor from 1875 to 1885 and chaplain from 1879 to 1885, besides being curate of Holy Trinity, Oxford, from 1870 to 1874 and vicar of St. John the Baptist, in the same city, from 1874 to 1879. He was rector of Kibworth-Beauchamp from 1884 to 1891 and also of Smeeton-Westerby, Leicestershire, in 1887–88, and was then vicar of Aston-juxta-Birmingham from 1891 to 1894, being likewise examining chaplain to the bishop of Worcester from 1892 to 1894. In 1894 he was consecrated suffragan bishop of Coventry, being at the same time both rector of St. Philip's, Birmingham, and archdeacon of Birmingham from 1894 to 1903. From 1892 to 1903 he was surrogate of the diocese of Worcester, and was appointed honorary canon of Worcester in 1892. In 1903 he was translated to the diocese of Manchester. He has written *Pastors and Teachers* (London, 1902).

KNOX, GEORGE WILLIAM: Presbyterian; b. at Rome, N. Y., Aug. 11, 1853. He was graduated at Hamilton College in 1874 and Auburn Theological Seminary in 1877. He then engaged in missionary work in Japan, and was professor of homiletics in Union Theological Seminary, Tokyo, 1881–93 and of philosophy and ethics in the Imperial University of Japan in 1886. In 1893 he returned to the United States and was pastor of the Presbyterian church at Rye, N. Y., 1894–99. He was lecturer on apologetics in Union Theological Seminary, New York City, 1897–99, and since 1899 has been professor of philosophy and history of religion in the same institution. He was vice-president of the Asiatic Society of Japan 1891–92, Nathaniel Taylor lecturer at Yale in 1903; also lecturer on the history of religion in 1905–06. In addition to works in Japanese he has written: *The Christian Point of View* (in collaboration with F. Brown and A. C. McGiffert (New York, 1902); *Direct and Fundamental Proofs of the Christian Religion* (1903); *Japanese Life in Town and Country* (1904); *The Spirit of the Orient* (1906); and *The Development of Religion in Japan* (1906).

KNOX, JOHN.

Earlier Life (§ 1).
Conversion to Protestantism (§ 2).
Ministry at St. Andrews (§ 3).
Confinement in the French Galleys (§ 4).
Ministry in England, 1549–54 (§ 5).
On the Continent, 1554–59 (§ 6).
Organization of the Church in Scotland (§ 7).
Knox and Queen Mary (§ 8).
Ministry in Edinburgh and Private Life (§ 9).
Personal Appearance and Manner (§ 10).
Testimonies to his Character (§ 11).

1. Earlier Life.

Neither the place nor the date of the birth of John Knox, the great Scotch Reformer, is settled beyond dispute; but the weightiest considerations favor Giffordgate, a suburb of the town of Haddington (16 m. e. of Edinburgh) as the place and 1513 or 1514 as the year (cf. H. Cowan, *John Knox*, pp. 22–25, 45–48). He died at Edinburgh Nov. 24, 1572. His father was William Knox, of fair, though not distinguished, descent, who fought at Flodden, and had his home in the county of Haddington. His mother's name was Sinclair. He received the elements of a liberal education in Haddington, which early possessed an excellent grammar-school—one of those schools originally monastic and due to the public spirit which, at least as regards education, animated the Scottish Church even antecedently to the Reformation. Thence he proceeded either to the University of Glasgow, where the name "John Knox" occurs among the *incorporati* in 1522, or to St. Andrews, where he is stated by Beza to have studied under the celebrated John Major (q.v.), a native, like Knox, of East Lothian and one of the greatest scholars of his time. Major was at Glasgow in 1522 and at St. Andrews in 1531. How long Knox remained at college is uncertain. He certainly never made any pretense to be such a scholar as his contemporaries George Buchanan and Alesius; nor is there evidence that he even graduated. That he was a fair Latinist, and accustomed to study, appears from the fact, which seems to be well attested, of his familiarity with the writings of Augustine and Jerome. He acquired the Greek and Hebrew languages at a later period, as his writings indicate. He was ordained to the priesthood at some date prior to 1540, when his status as a priest is first mentioned. It appears from evidence adduced by Laing (in his ed. of the *Works* of Knox), that in 1543 Knox had not yet divested himself of Roman orders; at any rate, in his character as a priest, he signed a notarial instrument dated Mar. 27 of that year, the original of which is still to be found in the charter-room at Tyninghame Castle. Up to this time, however, he seems to have employed himself in private tuition, rather than in parochial duties; and, at the moment when he last signed his name as a priest, he was probably already engaged in the office—which he held for several years—of tutor in the family of Hugh Douglas of Longniddry, in East Lothian, with the further charge of the son of a neighboring gentleman, John Cockburn of Ormiston. Both of these lairds, like Knox himself, had even at this time a leaning to the new doctrines.

2. Conversion to Protestantism.

Knox first publicly professed the Protestant faith about the end of 1545. His mind had in all probability been directed to that faith for some time before the change was avowed. According to Calderwood, Thomas Guillaume, a native of East Lothian, of the order of Blackfriars and for a short time chaplain to the Regent Arran in 1543, was the first "to give Mr. Knox a taste of the truth." Beza attributes his original change of opinion to the study in early manhood, as already stated, of Augustine and Jerome. But the immediate instrument, probably, of his actual conversion was the learned and amiable George Wishart (q.v.) who, after a period of banishment, returned to his native country in 1544, to perish, within two years, at the stake, as the last and most illustrious of the victims of Cardinal Beaton. Among other places where he preached the Reformed doctrines Wishart had come to East Lothian in Dec., 1545, and there made Knox's acquaintance. The attachment which the latter formed for the person as well as for the doctrine of Wishart, must be described as of the nature of a youthful enthusiasm. Knox followed the Reformer everywhere, and constituted himself his body-guard, bearing, it is said, a two-edged sword, that he might be prepared to defend him against the cardinal's emissaries, who were known to be seeking Wishart's life. And, on the night of the latter's apprehension, Knox was hardly restrained from sharing his captivity, and consequently, in all probability, his fate. The words of Wishart's remonstrance are well known: "Nay, return to your bairns [pupils]. One is sufficient for a sacrifice."

Knox was first called to the Protestant ministry at St. Andrews, which was throughout his life intimately associated with the Reformer's career.

3. Ministry at St. Andrews.

There appears to have been no regular ordination. Of course, he had been already ordained as a priest in the Church of Rome. But imposition of hands and other forms were not regarded by Knox as of more than secondary importance. A graphic account of the whole proceedings connected with his call to the ministry, together with a report of the first sermon he delivered in St. Andrews, will be found in his *History of the Reformation.*

4. Confinement in the French Galleys.

At this time he was residing in the castle of St. Andrews. After Beaton's death, this stronghold became a place of refuge for many of the Protestants. Along with his pupils, the sons of the lairds of Longniddry and Ormiston, already mentioned, Knox passed there some comparatively peaceful months. His repose was rudely interrupted by the investiture and capitulation of the castle in the end of July, 1547, succeeded, as regarded Knox and some of the rest of the refugees, by confinement in the French galleys. He spent nineteen months as a galley-slave, amid hardships and miseries which are said to have permanently injured his health. "How long I continued prisoner," he said at St. Andrews, in 1559, "what torments I sustained in the galleys, and what were the sobs of my heart, is now no time to recite." He adds, however, that he always continued to hope for a return to his native country. In the *History* (vol. i., p. 228), the same confidence of a return is referred to as never having forsaken him; and he gives a curious testimony to the fact, by mentioning how, on one occasion, "lying betwixt Dundee and St. Andrews, the second time that the galleys returned to Scotland, the said John [Knox] being so extremely sick that few hoped his life, Maister [afterwards Sir] James [Balfour, one of his fellow prisoners] willed him to look to the land, and asked if he knew it. Who answered, 'Yes, I know it well; for I see the steeple of that place where God first in public opened my mouth to his glory; and I am fully persuaded, how weak soever I now appear, that I shall not depart this life, till that my tongue shall glorify his godly name in the same place.'"

5. Ministry in England, 1549–54.

On his release, which took place early in 1549, through the intervention, apparently, of the English government, Knox found that, in the existing state of the country, he could be of little use in his beloved Scotland. For nearly ten years, accordingly, he submitted to voluntary exile, like many of the worthiest of his countrymen in those troublous times. All these years, however, he devoted himself to ministerial labors in connection with the Reformed Church. His first sphere of duty was provided for him in England, for the space of about five years as a minister of the English Church. It is to be remembered that, during the whole reign of Edward VI., the Church of England was in a transition state; some of its most marked peculiarities (to which Knox himself and others in Scotland and abroad afterward objected) were then in abeyance, or at least not insisted upon as terms of communion. Thus the use of the prayer-book was not enforced, neither was kneeling at the communion. Episcopal government was of course acknowledged; but Knox held his commission, as a Reformed preacher, directly from the privy council, and was virtually independent of diocesan jurisdiction. Moreover, he seems to have had no strong objection to episcopacy itself, although he disapproved of "your proud prelates' great dominions and charge, impossible by one man to be discharged;" and on this, along with other grounds, he declined the bishopric of Rochester in 1552. The offices he held in the Church of England are briefly indicated in the *History,* which says, "He was first appointed preacher to Berwick, then to Newcastle; and last he was called to London and to the southern parts of England, where he remained till the death of Edward VI." (*Works,* i., p. 280). From other sources it appears that in 1551 he was appointed one of the six chaplains in ordinary to the king; and in this capacity there was submitted to him, and, after revisal, he joined the other chaplains in sanctioning, *The Articles concerning an Uniformity in Religion* of 1552, which became the basis of the Thirty-nine Articles (q. v.) of the Church of England.

6. On the Continent, 1554–59.

From England, after the death of Edward, Knox proceeded to the continent, traveling for a time from place to place in some uncertainty. In Sept. 1554, while living at Geneva, he accepted in accordance with Calvin's counsel a call to the English Church at Frankfort. Here controversies in connection with vestments, ceremonies, and the use of the English prayer-book met him, and, notwithstanding the great moderation which he showed from first to last, led, in Mar., 1555, to his resignation of his charge (cf. his treatise, *A Brief Narrative of the Troubles which Arose at Frankfurt,* reprinted in Laing's edition of his works). He returned to Geneva, where he was invited to become minister of the refugee English congregation. In August, however, he was induced to set out for Scotland, where he remained for nine months, preaching Evangelical doctrine in various parts of the country, and persuading those who favored the Reformation to cease from attendance at mass, and to join with himself in the celebration of the Lord's Supper according to a Reformed ritual. In May, 1556, he was cited to appear before the hierarchy in Edinburgh, and he boldly responded to the summons; but the bishops found it expedient not to proceed with the trial. In July an urgent call from his congregation at Geneva, along, probably, with the desire to prevent the renewal of persecution in Scotland, caused him to resume his Genevan ministry. His marriage to Marjorie Bowes, daughter of Richard Bowes, captain of Norham Castle, had meanwhile taken place, and his wife along with her mother accompanied him to Geneva, where they arrived in September. The church in which he preached there (called the Église de Notre Dame la Neuve) had been granted, at Calvin's solicitation, for the use of the English and Italian congregations by the municipal authorities. Knox's life in Geneva was no idle one. To preaching and clerical work of an exacting kind he added a large correspondence; and he was constantly engaged in literary work. His publications at Geneva included his *First Blast against the Monstrous Regiment* [*Rule*] *of Women;* and his long and elaborate treatise on predestination (published 1560) was composed in Geneva. With the exception of some months spent at Dieppe (1557–58) when he was contemplating a return to Scotland, he continued to officiate in Geneva (while deeply interested in his native land and in constant communication with the reform party there) till Jan., 1559, when he finally left for home.

7. Organization of the Church in Scotland.

He arrived in Edinburgh May 2, 1559. The time was a critical one. During his absence the reform party had become more numerous, more self-reliant and aggressive, and better consolidated. The queen dowager, Mary of Lorraine, acting as regent for her daughter, the young Mary, queen of Scots, then in France, had become more desirous to crush the Protestants and determined to use force. Civil war was imminent, but each side shrank from the first step. Knox at once became the leader of the Reformers. He preached against "idolatry" with the greatest boldness, and with the result that what he calls the "rascal multitude" began the "purging" of churches and the destruction of monasteries. Politics and religion were closely intertwined; the Reformers were struggling to keep Scotland free from the yoke of France, and did not hesitate to seek the help of England. Knox negotiated with the English government to secure its support, and he approved of the declaration of the lords of his party in Oct., 1559, suspending their allegiance to the regent. The death of the latter in June, 1560, opened the way to a cessation of hostilities and an agreement leaving the settlement of ecclesiastical questions to the Scottish estates. The doctrine, worship, and government of the Roman Church were overthrown by the parliament of 1560 and Protestantism was established as the national religion. Knox, assisted by five other ministers, formulated the confession of faith adopted at this time (see Scotch Confession of Faith) and drew up the constitution of the new Church—the *First Book of Discipline* (see the section on the Church of Scotland in the article Presbyterians).

8. Knox and Queen Mary.

Queen Mary returned to Scotland in Aug., 1561, thoroughly predisposed against Knox; while he and the other Reformers looked upon her with anxiety and suspicion. Fundamental differences of character and training made a keen encounter between the two inevitable. Five personal interviews between Knox and the queen are recorded (each at Mary's invitation). He found her no mean opponent in argument, and had to acknowledge the acuteness of her mind, if he could not commend the qualities of her heart. His attitude for the most part was unyielding and repelling, his language and manner harsh and uncourtierlike. In his preaching and other public utterances he was sometimes even violent. It must be remembered, however, that the momentous issues at stake required a plain-spoken prophet, not a smooth-tongued courtier. Still it might have been wiser as well as more Christlike for Knox, at the outset of their intercourse, to seek to win rather than repel. Perhaps the Reformer feared Mary's well-known power of fascination and steeled himself against it. Later his heart became wholly hardened toward the adulterous accomplice, as be believed, of her husband's murderer.

9. Ministry in Edinburgh and Private Life.

Knox's life from the time of his return to Scotland in 1559 is a part of the history of his country and its full story is to be sought in the histories of Scotland. Only details which have a more personal interest can be noted here. When the Reformed religion was formally ratified by law in Scotland in 1560 he was appointed minister of the Church of St. Giles, then the great parish church of Edinburgh. He was at this time in the fulness of his powers, as is manifest abundantly in the style of his *History of the Reformation*—a work which appears to have been begun about 1559, and completed in the course of the next six or seven years. The *History*, if sometimes rough and even coarse in language, and not always commendable in temper and spirit, is written with a force and vigor not surpassed by any of his other writings—of all which it may be said, that, whatever their faults, they are works of true genius, and well worthy in their character, upon the whole, of the great leader and statesman who wrote them. At the very beginning of his labors as minister of Edinburgh, he had the misfortune to lose his much-loved and helpful young wife, whom Calvin described as *suavissima*. She left two sons, one of whom, Nathanael, died at Cambridge in 1580; the other, Eleazer, became vicar of Clacton Magna in the archdeaconry of Colchester and died in 1591. In 1564 Knox made a second marriage, which was greatly talked of at the time because the bride was remotely connected with the royal family and still more because she was a maiden of seventeen while Knox was three times as old. The young lady was Margaret Stewart, daughter of Andrew, Lord Stewart of Ochiltree. She bore Knox three daughters, of whom the youngest, Elizabeth, became the wife of the famous John Welsh, minister of Ayr. At this time the Reformer lived a very laborious life. He was much engrossed with the public affairs of the national Church, and at the same time devoted to his work as a parish minister, to say nothing of his continual, and perhaps, in his position, unavoidable controversies, more or less personal, with the ecclesiastical and political factions of the day, which he regarded as his country's enemies. He was, however, not without social and family enjoyments. A fair stipend of four hundred marks Scots, equal to about forty-four pounds of English money of that day, enabled him to exercise hospitality and to advance money to a friend in need. He had a good house, which was provided and kept in repair by the municipality. His home, during the greater part of his ministry in Edinburgh, stood on the site now occupied by the City Council Chambers. Another house in Edinburgh, still preserved with little change and known since the eighteenth century at latest as "John Knox's house," may have been occupied by him toward the close of his life. With all his severity, there must have been much sympathy in a man who was repeatedly invited to reconcile the sundered, husband with wife, friend with friend. He lived in kindly relations with his neighbors, many of whom, in every rank, were among his intimate friends, and he was not indisposed to mirth and humor, of which, as of other traits of his character, his writings furnish abundant evidence.

10. Personal Appearance and Manner.

An interesting description of Knox's appearance, and especially of his style as a preacher, in his later years, is furnished in the *Diary of James Melville* (published by the Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh, 1829, pp. 26, 33). Melville was at the time a student in St. Andrews, and the period he refers to is the year 1571, when Knox, for his personal security, had, not for the first time in his life, taken refuge in that city. "Of all the benefits I had that year," writes Melville, "was the coming of that most notable prophet and apostle of our nation, Mr. John Knox, to St. Andrews, who, by the faction of the queen occupying the castle and town of Edinburgh, was compelled to remove therefrom, with a number of the best, and chose to come to St. Andrews. . . . Mr. Knox would sometimes come in, and repose him in our college-yard, and call us scholars unto him, and bless us, and exhort us to know God and his work in our country, and stand by the good cause; to use our time well, and learn the good instructions, and follow the good example, of our masters. . . . He was very weak. I saw him every day of his doctrine go hulie and fear [slowly and warily], with a furring of martriks about his neck, a staff in the one hand, and good godly Richard Ballantyne, his servant, holding up the other oxter [arm-pit], from the abbey to the parish church; and by the said Richard and another servant lifted up to the pulpit, where he behoved to lean at his first entry; but ere he had done with his sermon, he was so active and vigorous that he was like to ding that pulpit in blads and flee out of it." A Latin epistle sent by Sir Peter Young to Beza in 1579, contains a description of the Reformer's personal appearance in later years. His stature was "a little under middle height"; his "limbs were graceful"; his head "of moderate size"; his face "longish"; his nose "beyond the average length"; his forehead "rather narrow"; his brows "standing out like a ridge"; his cheeks "somewhat full" as well as "ruddy"; his mouth "large"; his "complexion darkish"; his eyes dark blue (or bluish grey) and his glance "keen"; his beard "black, with white hairs intermingled" and a "span and a half long." In his countenance, which was "grave and severe," "a certain graciousness was united with natural dignity and majesty."

John Knox died as he had lived—full of faith, but always ready for conflict. He found a devoted nurse in his young wife; and all the noblest and best men of Scotland hung about his house for tidings of the progress of his malady, in the vain hope of his being longer spared. His servant, Richard Ballantyne, after detailing the incidents of his last hours, says of him: "Of this manner departit this man of God, the lycht of Scotland, the comfort of the Kirke within the same, the mirrour of Godliness, and patrone and exemple to all trew ministeris, in puritie of lyfe, soundness in doctrine, and in bauldness in reproving of wicketness, and one that caired not the favore of men (how great soever they were) to reprove thair abuses and synes . . . . What dexteritie in teiching, bauldness in reproving, and hatred of wickedness was in him, my ignorant dulness is not able to declair." A higher testimony to the worth of a man not without faults was pronounced at his grave in the churchyard of St. Giles by the Earl of Mortoun, the regent of Scotland, in the presence of an immense concourse, who had followed the body to its last resting-place: "Here lyeth a man who in his life never feared the face of man, who hath been often threatened with dagge and dagger, but yet hath ended his dayes in peace and honour."

11. Testimonies to His Character.

W. Lee†, revised by Henry Cowan.

Bibliography: The *Works* of Knox are best consulted in the excellent edition by David Laing, printed for the Bannatyne Club, 6 vols., Edinburgh, 1864, which includes the principal sources for a biography, viz., his *History of the Reformation*, his correspondence, and other historical matter, such as Smeaton's account of his last illness and death. Other sources are: the *Memorials of Transactions in Scotland* by Richard Bannatyne and the *Memoirs of J. Melville*, both published for the Bannatyne Club, Edinburgh. Of modern lives the first was that by T. McCrie, new ed. with additions by A. Crichton, London, 1889. Other biographies or discussions of phases of the life are: by F. Brandes, Elberfeld, 1862; P. Lorimer, *J. Knox and the Church of England*, London, 1875; T. Carlyle, *Heroes and Hero Worship*, Essay iv., ib. 1884; W. M. Taylor, New York, 1885; R. W. Gosse, London, 1888; R. L. Stevenson, in *Familiar Studies of Men and Books*, ib. 1888; P. H. Brown, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1895; J. C. Carrick, *John Knox and his Land*, Glasgow, 1902; R. Mulot, *John Knox, 1505–72*, Halle, 1904; J. Stalker, *John Knox, his Ideals and Ideas*, London, 1904; H. Cowan, New York, 1905; J. Glasse, New York, 1905; A. T. Innes, Edinburgh, 1905; A. Lang, *John Knox and the Reformation*, London, 1905; D. MacMillan, London, 1905; C. Martin, *La Genèse des doctrines de John Knox*, Paris, 1906; I. Crook, Cincinnati, 1907; W. Walker, *Greatest Men of the Christian Church*, Chicago, 1908; *DNB*, xxxi. 308–328. Besides this the various works on the Reformation of Scotland discuss the subject.

KNOX-LITTLE, WILLIAM JOHN: Church of England; b. at Stewartstown (12 m. n. of Armagh), County Tyrone, Ireland, Dec. 1, 1839. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge (B.A., 1862), and was ordered deacon in 1863 and ordained priest in the following year. He was curate of Christ Church, Lancaster (1863–64), assistant master of Sherborne School (1865–70), curate of Turweston, Bucks (1870–74), and of St. Thomas, Regent Street, London (1874–75), and rector of St. Alban's, Cheetwood, Manchester (1875–85), and vicar of Hoar Cross, Burton-on-Trent (1885–1907). He has also been canon of Worcester since 1881, proctor for chapter in Convocation of Canterbury since 1888, and subdean of Worcester since 1902. He has written: *The Three Hours' Agony of Our Blessed Redeemer* (Manchester, 1877); *Sermons preached for the most Part in Manchester* (London, 1880); *Characteristics and Motives of the Christian Life* (1880);

The Mystery of the Passion of Our Most Holy Redeemer (1881); *The Witness of the Passion of Our Most Holy Redeemer* (1884); *The Hopes and Decisions of the Passion of Our Most Holy Redeemer* (1886); *The Broken Vow: A Story of Here and Hereafter* (1887); *The Child of Stafferton; A Chapter from a Family Chronicle* (1888); *The Light of Life* (sermons; 1889); *Sunlight and Shadow in the Christian Life* (sermons; 1889); *The Christian Home, its Foundation and Duties* (1891); *The Journey of Life* (sermons; 1892); *Sketches in Sunshine and Storm* (1892); *Labour and Sorrow* (sermons; 1894); *The Waif from the Waves: A Story of three Lives* (1894); *Treasury of Meditation* (1896); *St. Francis of Assisi, his Times, Life, and Work* (1897); *The Perfect Life* (sermons; 1898); *Sketches and Studies in South Africa* (1899); *David the Hero King of Israel* (1903); and *The Conflict of Ideals within the Church of England* (1905).

KNUDTZON, knut′zən, **JOERGEN ALEXANDER:** Norwegian Orientalist; b. at Trondhjem (240 m. n. of Christiania) Sept. 9, 1854. He studied at the universities of Christiania (Ph.D., 1889), Berlin, and Leipsic (studying in Germany from 1885 to 1887). He studied theology primarily at the request of Prof. C. P. Caspari of Christiania, who intended to have Knudtzon as his successor, but the latter, after completing his training in Germany and delivering a course of lectures for a term at Christiania, was regarded not sufficiently conservative. He accordingly withdrew from theology in favor of Assyriology, holding that theology "as a science must be historical and critical"; and was lecturer in Assyriology at the University of Christiania, 1894–1907; and since 1907 professor of Semitic languages there. He has written *Om det saakaldte perfektum og imperfektum i hebraisk* (Christiania, 1889); *Assyrische Gebete an den Sonnengott für Staat und königliches Haus aus der Zeit Asarhaddons und Asurbanipals* (2 vols., Leipsic, 1893); *Die zwei Arzawa-Briefe, die ältesten Urkunden in indogermanischer Sprache* (in collaboration with S. Bugge and A. Torp; 1902); and *Die El-Amarna Tafeln in Umschrift und Uebersetzung* (1907).

KOCH, kōн, **ANTON:** German Roman Catholic; b. at Pfronstetten (near Münsingen, 23 m. w. of Ulm), Württemburg, Apr. 19, 1859. He studied at the University of Tübingen and the seminary of Rottenburg, and was ordained to the priesthood in 1884. He was stationed at Schönberg, near Ellwangen, for two years, and from 1886 to 1889 was lecturer at the Wilhelmstift, Tübingen. In 1889–91 he was privat-docent in Tübingen, and then teacher of religion at a gymnasium in Stuttgart for three years. In 1894 he was recalled to Tübingen as associate professor of moral and pastoral theology, and since 1896 has been professor of the same subjects there. He has written *Der heilige Faustus, Bischof von Riez* (Stuttgart, 1895), and *Lehrbuch der Moraltheologie* (Freiburg, 1905).

KOEBERLE, kū′ber-lê, **JUSTUS ADOLF:** German Lutheran; b. at Memmingen (33 m. s.e. of Ulm) June 27, 1871; d. at Rostock Feb. 7, 1908. He studied in Halle, Berlin, and Erlangen from 1889 to 1893, and after four years of pastoral work in Munich became a lecturer in the University of Erlangen in 1898, privat-docent in 1899, and in 1904 professor of Old-Testament exegesis and Oriental philology. In theology he was an adherent of the Erlangen school. He wrote: *De Elohistae Pentateuchi prioris qui vocatur ethica* (Erlangen, 1896); *Die Tempelsänger im Alten Testament* (1899); *Natur und Geist nach der Auffassung des Alten Testaments* (Munich, 1901); *Die Motive des Glaubens an die Gebetserhörung im Alten Testament* (Leipsic, 1901); *Die geistige Kultur der semitischen Völker* (1901); *Babylonische Kultur und biblische Religion* (Munich, 1903); *Sünde und Gnade im religiösen Leben des Volkes Israel bis auf Christum* (1905); *Das Rätsel des Leidens, eine Einführung in das Buch Hiob* (Berlin, 1905); and *Zum Kampfe um das Alte Testament* (Wismar, 1906; 2d ed., with title *Die alttestamentliche Offenbarung*, 1908); *Der Prophet Jeremia. Sein Leben und Wirken* (Calw, 1908); and has been since 1907 one of the editors of *Theologie der Gegenwart.*

KOEGEL, kū′gl, **THEODOR JOHANNES RUDOLF:** German Protestant; b. at Birnbaum (44 m. w.n.w. of Posen), Prussia, Feb. 18, 1829; d. in Berlin June 2, 1896. He attended the gymnasium at Halle, and afterward studied philosophy and theology at the universities of Halle and Berlin. He became intimate with Tholuck, was his amanuensis, and later accompanied him on a journey to France and Spain. He was a gymnasial teacher in Dresden 1852–54, pastor in charge at Nakel, near Bromberg, 1854–57, and pastor of the German Evangelical congregation at The Hague 1857–63. Early in 1863 he was called to Berlin as court preacher, and in 1873 was appointed first court preacher, general superintendent of the Kurmark, and ephorus of the Cathedral Probationers' Foundation.

Kögel was distinguished particularly as a preacher, and also for his part in ecclesiastical affairs. His sermons are true to the text, but they invariably bear a definite stamp of their own. Their wealth of content is conveyed in a concise, sharply pointed style; and the copious illustrations from history and human life are vividly presented in terms exceedingly brief and plastic. His sermons bear the impress of a powerful moral earnestness, psychological acumen, and discriminating taste. Esthetic and poetical endowment becomes distinctly subservient to the art of preaching. Kögel exercised a considerable influence over the internal and external development of the Prussian State Church in the decade after 1870. Two of his characteristic traits are conspicuous in this connection: first, his unconditional championship of the Union; second, his sharp opposition to the Protestant Association. In conformity to this last was his antagonism toward Emil Herrmann's synodical constitution plans, which seemed to him to jeopardize the integrity of the confessional standard of doctrine. These antagonisms became especially acute on occasion of the extraordinary general synod of 1875, and led to the founding of the Positive Union party under Kögel's leadership. The final consequence was that in 1878 Kögel was called to the superior ecclesiastical council, from which soon afterward President Herrmann withdrew. In the course of the years 1892–94 he retired from his offices on account of infirmity. His sermons form the bulk of his writings. Of these he published numerous collections, including: *Der erste Brief Petri* (Mainz, 1863); *Die Seligpreisungen der Bergpredigt* (Berlin, 1869); *Das Vaterunser* (1873); *Aus dem Vorhof ins Heiligthum* (2 vols., Bremen, 1875–76); *Der Brief Pauli an die Römer* (1876); *Wach auf, du Stadt Jerusalem* (1882); *Das Evangelium Johannis* (2 parts, 1892–93); and *Gelaut und Geleit durchs Kirchenjahr* (2 parts, 1895–96). Other works are: *Reden und Ansprachen* (1887); *Ethisches und Aesthetisches. Vorträge und Betrachtungen* (1888); and *Gedichte* (1891). With W. Baur and E. Frommel he edited the year-book *Neue Christoterpe* (Bremen, 1880 sqq.).

Georg Rietschel.

Bibliography: G. Kögel, *Rudolf Kögel, sein Werden und Wirken*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1899–1904; *Christliche Welt*, 1897, pp. 258 sqq. (on Kögel as a poet).

KOEHLER, kō̆h'ler, **(PHILIPP) AUGUST:** German Protestant Biblical scholar; b. at Schmalenberg (50 m. s.s.w. of Heidelberg), in the Rhenish Palatinate, Feb. 8, 1835; d. at Erlangen Feb. 17, 1897. He began his education at the gymnasium of Zweibrücken, and then studied theology at Bonn, Erlangen, and Utrecht. In 1857 he established himself as privat-docent at Erlangen, and in 1862 became professor extraordinary for Old-Testament exegesis. In 1864 he was called as ordinary professor to Jena, in 1866 to Bonn, and in 1868 back to Erlangen as successor of Delitzsch. Here he labored for twenty-nine years, becoming one of the most influential members of the theological faculty. His endowments fitted him for testing the views of others, rather than to enter new paths of investigation. His theological tendency was influenced chiefly by Delitzsch and Hofmann. Like them, he emphasized throughout his life the importance of Old-Testament history as a history of salvation preparatory to Christianity. His first comprehensive work was exegetical, *Die nachexilischen Propheten erklärt:* part i., *Die Weissagung Haggais* (Erlangen, 1860); part ii., *Die Weissagung Sacharjas* (1861); part iii., *Die Weissagung Sacharjas* (1863); part iv., *Die Weissagung Maleachis* (1865). But the most important work is his *Lehrbuch der Biblischen Geschichte Alten Testaments* (2 parts, in sections, Erlangen, 1875–85, Leipsic, 1889–93). It was not a history of the people of Israel that he undertook to write, but only an account of what the Old Testament itself tells about the origin and history of its people, with a detailed examination of the Old-Testament sources by the aid of the modern scientific apparatus. He freely admits the existence of different accounts of single events and whole periods of Israelitic history, as, for instance, the Jahvistic and Elohistic sources in the Pentateuch, his aim being to show from the Old Testament what finally developed in the post-exilic time as the common view of the Old-Testament community in regard to its history on the basis of the differing accounts. He made a distinction between the secular and theological content in Biblical history. From the use which Jesus made of the Old Testament he inferred that it was to be considered as God's instruction to his congregation concerning his former revelations. The books of the Bible, he states, originated in the same way as other books. The historians of the Old Testament never show that in the composition of their works they had not the same freedom or independence of judgment as other historians. But if those books in spite of that fact have been regarded by Jesus and the apostles as the word of God to his congregation, the Christian congregation has a sure test that there is to be found in them the most faithful representation of the deeds and revelations of God. On the other hand, the Old Testament does not pretend to be a God-given document concerning the knowledge of the things of the natural life, as, for instance, of the primitive history of man and the secular history of Israel, but only a God-given document concerning the knowledge of the revelations of God in so far as they reflect themselves in the consciousness of Israel as the congregation of God. Of other works may be mentioned, *Die niederländische reformierte Kirche* (Erlangen, 1856); *De pronunciatione ac vi sacrosancti tetragrammatis* יהוה (1866); and *Ueber Berichtigung der Lutherischen Bibelübersetzung* (1886). (Ernst Sellin.)

Bibliography: *NKZ*, viii (1897), 273–297.

KOEHLER, WALTER ERICH: German Lutheran; b. at Elberfeld (16 m. e.n.e. of Düsseldorf), Dec. 27, 1870. He studied in Halle, Heidelberg (Ph.D., 1895), Strasburg, Bonn, and Tübingen (lic. theol., 1898), and in 1900 became privat-docent for church history at Giessen, associate professor of the same subject in 1904; and professor of church history at Zurich, 1909. In theology he belongs to the critical school. He has written: *Die katholischen Kirchen des Morgenlandes* (Darmstadt, 1896); *Luther und die Kirchengeschichte, i.* (Erlangen, 1900); *Reformation und Ketzerprozess* (Tübingen, 1901); *Dokumente zum Ablassstreit von 1517* (1902); *Die Entstehung des Problems Staat und Kirche* (1903); *Ein Wort zu Denifles Luther* (1904), *Die Anfänge des Pictismus in Giessen 1689–1695* (Giessen, 1907); besides preparing a *Kritische Ausgabe von Luthers fünfundneunzig Thesen mit Gegenschriften* (Leipsic, 1903).

KOENIG, kō̆'nig, **ARTHUR:** German Roman Catholic; b. at Neisse (46 m. s.s.e. of Breslau) June 4, 1843. He studied at the University of Breslau 1861–66 and at the theological seminary in the same city 1866–67, and was ordained to the priesthood in 1867. He was instructor in religion at the gymnasium of Gross Glogau 1867–68, going thence in a similar capacity to the Realschule at Neisse. In 1882 he was appointed professor of dogmatic theology at the University of Breslau, exchanging this position in 1898 for the professorship of pastoral theology. He has written: *Die Echtheit der Apostelgeschichte* (Breslau, 1867); *Das Zeugnis der Natur für Gottes Dasein* (Freiburg, 1870); *Lehrbuch für den katholischen Religionsunterricht in den oberen Klassen der Gymnasien und Realschulen* (1879); *Handbuch für den katholischen Religionsunterricht in den mittleren Klassen der Gymnasien und Realschulen* (1880); *Schöpfung und Gotteserkenntnis* (1885); *Der katholische Priester vor*

1500 Jahren (Breslau, 1890); *Officium des heiligen Rosenkranzes* (1891); *Lebensbilder und Charakterzüge aus der Kirchengeschichte* (Glatz, 1890); *Ein Blatt aus der Geschichte des schlesischen Schulwesens* (Breslau, 1903); and *Aus dem Kampfe um den Gottesglauben* (1904).

KOENIG, FRIEDRICH EDUARD: German Protestant; b. at Reichenbach (56 m. s. of Leipsic), Saxony, Nov. 15, 1846. He studied in Leipsic (Ph.D., 1874), where he became privat-docent in 1879 and associate professor of Old-Testament exegesis in 1885. In 1888 he went to Rostock as full professor of the same subject, and since 1900 has occupied a similar position at the University of Bonn. In theology he is one of the leading adherents of the conservative school. His writings include: *Gedanke, Laut und Akzent als die drei Faktoren der Sprachbildung* (Weimar, 1874); *Neue Studien über Schrift, Aussprache und generelle Formenlehre des Aethiopischen* (Leipsic, 1877); *De criticae sacrae argumento e linguae legibus repetito* (1879); *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache* (3 vols., 1881–97); *Der Offenbarungsbegriff des Alten Testaments* (2 vols., 1882); *Die Hauptprobleme der altisraelitischen Religionsgeschichte* (1884; Eng. transl. by A. J. Campbell, *The Religious History of Israel*, Edinburgh, 1885); *Falsche Extreme in der neuren Kritik des Alten Testaments* (Leipsic, 1895); *Der Glaubensact der Christen nach Begriff und Fundament untersucht* (Erlangen, 1891); *The Exiles' Book of Consolation contained in Isaiah xl.–lxvi.* (Edinburgh, 1899); *Die Originalität des neulich entdeckten hebräischen Sirachtextes* (Freiburg, 1899); *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik in Bezug auf die biblische Literatur* (Leipsic, 1900); *Neueste Prinzipien der alttestamentlichen Kritik* (Berlin, 1902); *Bibel und Babel* (1902; Eng. transl. by K. T. Pilter, *Bible and Babylon*, London, 1905); *Die Bibel-Babel-Frage und die wissenschaftliche Methode* (1904); and *Prophetenideal, Judentum und Christentum* (1906); *Hebräische Grammatik* (Leipsic, 1908); *Talmud und Neues Testament* (Gross-Lichterfelde, 1908); and *Geschichte des Reiches Gottes bis auf Jesus Christus* (Brunswick, 1908).

KOENIG, kʊ′nig, SAMUEL: Swiss Pietist; b. at Gerzensee (9 m. s.s.e. of Bern), 1670; d. at Bern May 31, 1750. He studied theology at Bern and Zurich, and after passing the examination for entrance into the Bernese ministry set out on a tour of Holland, England, and Germany. In England the mystical writings of Jane Lead (q.v.) exercised an extraordinary influence over him. Returning to Bern in 1693, he became preacher at the Church of the Holy Ghost and gained approval by his sermons, in which, from a desire of popularity, he espoused the cause of orthodoxy against the younger school of Pietists, including Güldin, Christian Lutz, and others. Personal association with the leaders of Pietism, however, won him over to their side, and with the same vehemence with which he had assailed them he now turned against the orthodox cause, thus arousing tremendous excitement in the religious world of Bern. König speedily ingrafted in the Pietistic teachings chiliastic and separatist tendencies which enabled the clergy to bring the Pietist leaders before the courts on the charge of heresy. The trial began in 1698 and continued till the spring of the following year, the Pietists being accused of disseminating heretical teachings, violating the ordinances and discipline of the Church, and disturbing the public peace. They defended themselves with great skill, and their arraignment of the orthodox system might have influenced any but the most stubborn of opponents. The verdict, however, had been determined beforehand, and König, as the most obnoxious critic of the existing system, was degraded from his clerical office and banished. Though the outcome of the trial was a severe blow to the Pietists, it wrought harm to the Church, since the severity of the sentence intensified the separatist tendency among the members of the sect, and it was only the labors of the younger Lutz that prevented a complete rupture with the Church. König wandered through Germany for many years, until in 1711 he was appointed French preacher to the count of Isenburg at Budingen. Unceasing yearning for home and the conviction that he had been unjustly treated made his long exile an unhappy one, and his antiorthodox writings increased in acerbity. Gradually, however, he withdrew from the field of theology, and successfully devoted himself to studies in Oriental languages and mathematics. In 1730 he was permitted to return to Bern, and the government created for him an associate professorship in languages and mathematics at the University, where his inability to maintain discipline still further embittered him. His renewed activity in Pietist propaganda exposed him to censure, but he escaped punishment in view of his age. The last years of his life were darkened by the banishment of his two sons, who were found guilty of taking part in the conspiracy of Hentzi against the aristocratic city government. Of König's works the most noteworthy is his *Etymologicon helleno-hebraicum* (Frankfort, 1722), in which he sought to derive the Greek language from Semitic sources, while his *Theologisches Prognostikon vom Untergang des türkischen Reichs* (Büdingen, 1717) is characteristic of his doctrinal bias. (W. Hadorn.)

Bibliography: F. Trechsel, *Samuel König und der Pietismus in Bern*, Bern, 1852; A. Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, pp. 406 sqq., Bonn, 1886; Hadorn, in *Kirchenfreund*, 1898, and 1899, pp. 194 sqq.

KOESTLIN, kūst′lin, HEINRICH ADOLF: German Lutheran; b. at Tübingen Sept. 4, 1846; d. in Cannstadt (4 m. n.e. of Stuttgart) June 5, 1907. He studied at the seminary of Schönthal (1860–64) and the University of Tübingen (1864–68), after which he was vicar in Weilheim, near Tübingen (1868–1869), private tutor to the family of Baron von Wächter, ambassador of Württemberg, at Paris (1869–70), chaplain of the Second Württemberg Field-Brigade in the Franco-Prussian war (1870–1871), tutor at the theological seminary at Tübingen (1871–73), and deacon at Sulz-on-the-Neckar (1873–74). He then held pastorates at Maulbronn (1875–78), Friedrichshafen (1878–81), and Stuttgart (1881–83). From 1883 to 1891 he was professor of theology at the seminary for preachers at Friedberg, Hesse, and from 1891 to 1895 was supreme consistorial councilor and superintendent of the province of Starkenburg. In 1895 he became privy ecclesiastical councilor and was appointed professor of theology in Giessen. He retired from active life in 1901, and resided at Darmstadt (1901–1904) and Cannstadt (after 1904). In 1883–85 he was a member of the committee for the preparation of a new hymnal for Hesse, and in 1900–04 was engaged in preparing the Hessian *Kirchenbuch*, the Hessian *Gemeindegebetbuch*, and similar works. In theology he held that "the object of all theology is to understand the person and message of Jesus Christ as the Savior of mankind, all creeds being but an approximate expression of the life and salvation in him." Besides editing the *Monatsschrift für Pastoraltheologie* at Berlin since 1904, he wrote *Aus ernsten Tagen, Feldpredigten* (Stuttgart, 1871); *Kandidatenfahrten* (Tübingen, 1875); *Geschichte der Musik* (1875); *Friedrich Silcher und Carl Maria von Weber* (Stuttgart 1877); *Die Tonkunst, Einführung in die Aesthetik der Musik* (1878); *Die Musik als christliche Volksmacht* (1878); *Josephine Lang* (Leipsic, 1881); *Luther als der Vater des evangelischen Kirchengesangs* (1882); *Der Begriff des geistlichen Amts* (Ludwigsburg, 1885); *Im Felde* (Darmstadt, 1886); *Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdiensts* (Tübingen, 1887); *Die Lehre von der Seelsorge nach evangelischen Grundsätzen* (Berlin, 1895); and *Predigten und Reden* (Giessen, 1901).

KOESTLIN, JULIUS THEODOR: German Protestant; b. at Stuttgart May 17, 1826; d. at Halle May 12, 1902. He was educated at the universities of Tübingen (1844–48) and Berlin (1849–1850), and in 1850 became lecturer in the theological seminary at Tübingen. Five years later he was appointed associate professor of theology at Göttingen, whence he was called in 1860 to Breslau as full professor of the same subject. From 1870 until 1896, when he retired from active life, he was professor of New-Testament exegesis at Halle. In 1849 he visited Scotland, where he studied Presbyterianism, later introducing certain Presbyterian features into German consistorial government. Among his numerous writings, special mention may be made of his: *Die schottische Kirche, ihr inneres Leben und ihr Verhältnis zum Staat* (Gotha, 1852); *Luthers Lehre von der Kirche* (Stuttgart, 1853); *Der Glaube, sein Wesen, Grund und Gegenstand* (Gotha, 1859); *Luthers Theologie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und ihrem inneren Zusammenhange* (2 vols., Stuttgart, 1863; Eng. transl., from the second German edition, *Theology of Luther in its Historical Development and Inner Harmony*, 2 vols., Philadelphia, 1897); *Martin Luther, sein Leben und seine Schriften* (2 vols., Elberfeld, 1875); *Luthers Leben* (Leipsic, 1882; Eng. transl., London, 1883); *Martin Luther der Reformator, Festschrift* (Halle, 1883; Eng. transl., London, 1883); *Autobiographie* (Danzig, 1891); *Die Begründung unserer sittlich-religiösen Ueberzeugungen* (Berlin, 1893); *Religion und Reich Gottes, Abhandlungen zur Dogmatik und Ethik* (Gotha, 1894); *Der Glaube und seine Bedeutung für Erkenntnis, Leben und Kirche* (Berlin, 1895); and *Christliche Ethik* (1899).

KOHLBRUEGGE, kōl′brū̆g-ge, **HERMANN FRIEDRICH:** Founder of the Dutch-Reformed congregation at Elberfeld; b. at Amsterdam Aug. 15, 1803; d. at Elberfeld (16 m. e. of Düsseldorf), Rhenish Prussia, Mar. 5, 1875. He was brought up as a Lutheran, and after attending the Latin school and the Athenaeum became assistant preacher to the Lutheran congregation at Amsterdam. He soon perceived that there was little left of Luther's spirit in the Lutheran Church of Holland, and his sermons on the radical corruption of human nature aroused the opposition of his rationalistic colleagues and resulted in his being deposed. After living in retirement for several years he became a convert to the Reformed faith; but the Reformed Church, fearing the disturbance of its peace, refused him admission. In 1833, while traveling for his health through the Rhine region, he accepted a call to Elberfeld, where his energetic personality, the peculiarity of his doctrinal system and the profound earnestness of his sermons made a deep impression. Already Gottfried Daniel Krummacher (q.v.) had aroused many earnest believers, and Kohlbrügge was eagerly demanded to continue his work; but the Prussian government, considering him a dangerous enemy of the plan of uniting the Lutheran and Reformed churches, forbade him the pulpit. For a number of years Kohlbrügge lived in retirement at Utrecht, interpreting the Scriptures every Sunday to some friends. Meanwhile the act of union had produced a great fermentation in the Rhine region, especially among the Reformed congregations. In Elberfeld a rupture occurred in the Reformed church, and in 1847 the dissenters elected Kohlbrügge as their pastor, and constituted themselves as the "Dutch Reformed" congregation. This body, which was recognized by royal patent of 1847, considered itself a member of the Dutch State Church and adopted the *Confessio Belgica* and the Heidelberg catechism. It still exists secluded from all outside movements of Christianity with a strict church order, legal church discipline, and well-organized charities.

The peculiarity of Kohlbrügge consists less in an actual deviation from the doctrine and confessions of the Reformed Church than in a one-sided conception of certain doctrinal points. In his effort to oppose to Pietism the objectivity and self-glory of grace, he did not emphasize strongly enough sanctification and renovation of the heart. His sermons, which constitute the bulk of his works, spread far beyond the borders of his congregation. Of his writings may be mentioned: *Das siebente Kapitel des Briefes Pauli an die Römer* (Elberfeld, 1839; Eng. transl., London, 1854); *Betrachtung über das erste Kapitel des Evangeliums nach Matthäus* (1844); *Das alte Testament nach seinem wahren Sinne gewürdigt aus den Schriften der Evangelisten und Apostel* (1846); *Schriftmässige Erläuterung des christlichen Bekenntnisses: "Ich glaube an den heiligen Geist"* (1855; Eng. transl., *Scriptural Elucidation of the Article on the Christian Faith: I Believe in the Holy Ghost*, 1856); *Das Amt der Presbyter* (1856); and *Blicke in das erste Kapitel des ersten Buches Samuelis* (1868). His numerous collections of his sermons include: *Sieben Predigten über Sacharja iii.* (Elberfeld, 1848); *Sieben Predigten über den Propheten Jona* (1849); *Acht Predigten über Evangelium*

Johannis (1849); *Predigten über die erste Epistel des Apostels Petrus* (1855; Eng. transl., 1856); *Zwanzig Predigten im Jahre 1846 gehalten* (Halle, 1857); and *Apostelgeschichte. Cap. 2–10. in 25 Predigten* (Elberfeld, 1874). Some of these sermons have appeared in English under the title *Miscellaneous Sermons* (London, 1855). (H. Calaminus.)

Bibliography: *Zur Erinnerung an Hermann Friedrich Kohlbrügge*, Elberfeld, 1875; *Eine Erinnerung an H. F. Kohlbrügge, Weiland Pastor der niederländische-reformirten Kirchen*, Hagen, 1882; A. Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, i. 593 sqq., Bonn, 1880.

KOHLER, CHRISTIAN and **HIERONYMUS:** Swiss fanatics and impostors, founders of the sect of the Brügglers. Christian was born in 1710 and Hieronymus in 1714 at Brügglen near Rüggisberg (9 m. s. of Bern), Switzerland, in a region dominated by the influence of sectaries, prophetesses, and mystics. From their father the two brothers inherited a reputation for hydromancy, and soon discovered how to turn their knowledge to material profit, revealing at the same time a certain degree of native talent and a cunning and ambition which became an important factor in gaining a following. They had received no regular education, one being a day-laborer and the other a wagoner, had married at an early age, and were conspicuous for their moral delinquencies. In 1745 a remarkable movement, traceable to the influence of pietistic separatism, broke out in Brügglen and its vicinity, when children began to pray and to preach to their elders. Among these inspired children were the offspring of the Kohler brothers, and from them the fanatic spirit passed to their parents, who now experienced visions and dreams, and related to their neighbors the wonderful revelations vouchsafed them during periods of ecstasy. It has been supposed that in the beginning the two men were subjects of self-deception, but it is not impossible that their ecstatic visions were deliberate mendacities. They made use of the plentiful apocalyptic literature of the time for all their revelations with regard to the millennium and the antichrist, while they shared with all separatists an irreconcilable hatred for the Church. Their sole innovation was their audacious impersonation of the Trinity, a claim in which they were assisted by a woman of evil repute named Elizabeth Kissling. Christian Kohler proclaimed himself the temple of the Father, Hieronymus that of the son, and the Kissling woman that of the Holy Ghost. The success of their imposture evidently turned their heads, for they made no attempt to preserve any consistency of deception, but announced themselves at various times as the two witnesses of the Apocalypse, as the servants of Christ and his representatives, and as the successors to the throne of God. The Kissling woman was not only the incarnation of the Holy Ghost, but also the woman of the Apocalypse who was to give birth to the Saviour. At the same time they continued to practise divination and answered questions concerning the condition of the dead, being able to speak with authority since Christian Kohler was in constant communication with heaven. In case the departed soul was declared by them to be in hell, they professed themselves able to absolve it, and thus profited by an active trade in indulgences. In 1750, after they had pursued their practises for more than five years, they were arrested and banished from the canton for six years. They frequently returned in secret, however, and renewed their prophecies until a price was set upon their heads. Hieronymus was seized Oct. 8, 1752, and executed Jan. 16, 1753; Elizabeth Kissling was imprisoned; and Christian, after incarceration, professed himself ready to abandon his beliefs. His subsequent fate is unknown. Most of the Brügglers were quite ignorant of the vicious character of their prophets and abjured their heresies, but some remained faithful to the "murdered Messiah," and awaited his speedy return. The sect disappeared, but about fifty years later the Antonians renewed many of their doctrines and practises (see Antonians, 2). (W. Hadorn.)

Bibliography: J. R. Kyburz, *Das entdeckte Geheimnis der Bosheit in der Brügglersekte*, 2 vols., Zurich, 1753; L. Meister, *Helvetische Szenen der neueren Schwärmerei und Intoleranz*, pp. 161 sqq., ib. 1785; J. R. Schlegel, *Kirchengeschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts*, II., ii. 1062 sqq., 3 vols., Heilbronn, 1784–96; K. R. Hagenbach, *Hist. of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries*, 2 vols., New York, 1869; Hadorn, in *Theologische Zeitschrift aus der Schweiz*, 1900, part iv.

KOHLER, KAUFMANN: German-American rabbi; b. at Fürth (5 m. n.w. of Nuremberg), Germany, May 10, 1848. He studied at the rabbinical schools of Hassfurt, Höchberg, Mainz, Altona, and Frankfort, and at the universities of Munich, Berlin, Leipsic, and Erlangen (Ph.D., 1868). In 1869 he came to the United States and was rabbi of Congregation Beth-El in Detroit until 1871. He then became rabbi of Sinai Congregation, Chicago, where he introduced Sunday lectures into the service of the American synagogue. In 1879 he was chosen rabbi of Temple Beth-El, New York City. In 1903 he was made honorary minister of that synagogue for life, that he might accept the proffered presidency of Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, O. He is one of the leaders of Reformed Judaism in the United States. He edited the weekly *Sabbath Visitor* 1881–82 and the weekly *Jewish Reformer* in 1886, and was editor of the departments of theology and philosophy of the *Jewish Encyclopedia*. He has edited *David Einhorn's ausgewählte Predigten und Reden* (New York, 1880) and has written: *Der Segen Jakob's* (Berlin, 1867); *Die Bibel und die Todesstrafe* (Leipsic, 1868); *Das hohe Lied übersetzt und kritisch neu bearbeitet* (New York, 1878); *Backwards or Forwards: Lectures on Reformed Judaism* (1885); *The Ethical Basis of Judaism* (1887); *Church and Synagogue in their Mutual Relations* (Chicago, 1889); and *A Guide to Instruction in Judaism* (New York, 1898).

KOLB, FRANZ: Reformer; b. at Intzlingen, near Lörrach (28 m. s.s.w. of Freiburg), Baden, 1465; d. at Bern Nov. 10, 1535. In 1491 he entered the University of Basel, where humanism was well represented; in 1497 he became master and teacher in St. Martin's school, but in 1502 he retired to a Carthusian monastery in Swabia. Zwingli was probably his successor in Basel. In 1504 Kolb went to Freiburg as cantor and preacher and afterward was active for some time in the neighboring

Murten. In 1507 he became rector of the schools in Freiburg. In the same year he went to Italy as field-chaplain with Swiss mercenaries in the service of Emperor Maximilian. In 1509 he left Freiburg and went to Bern as cathedral preacher. He was a stern moralist and arraigned the people for their vices. With less success he attacked the demoralizing mercenary traffic, and because of these attacks was forced to leave Bern in 1512 and again retired to a Carthusian monastery, this time at Nuremberg. He preached the Reformation in Nuremberg, but was persecuted in 1522 and fled. On the recommendation of Luther, apparently, he received the post of preacher from Count George II. of Wertheim. Here he was active in the reform of the church service, but inclined toward the doctrinal conceptions of Zwingli with whom he soon afterward came in personal contact at Zurich. On this account in 1525 he lost the confidence of his protector and returned to Nuremberg, where the Reformation in the mean time had achieved its full victory. Kolb was suspected, however, of sympathizing with the teachings of sectaries like Denk and Münzer, who at that time were active in Nuremberg, and although cleared of this suspicion, he applied in 1526 to Zwingli for a position, and in the following year became the assistant of Berthold Haller in Bern. With Haller he took the most prominent part in the great disputation of 1528 which achieved the victory of the Gospel in Bern (see BERN, DISPUTATION OF). Kolb's *Wertheimer Ratschlag* (1524) gives his views; and some of his letters are in the Luther and the Zwingli correspondence. (E. BLÖSCH†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: L. Eissenlöffel, *Franz Kolb*, Zell, n. d.; S. Fischer, *Reformation und Disputation in Bern*, Bern, 1828.

KOLDE, THEODOR (FRIEDRICH HERMANN): German Lutheran; b. at Friedland (26 m. s.e. of Königsberg), Upper Silesia, May, 6 1850. He studied in Breslau (1869–70) and Leipsic (1871–72; Ph. D., Halle, 1874; lic. theol., Marburg, 1876), and in 1876 became privat-docent for church history in Marburg, where he was appointed associate professor in 1879. Since 1881 he has been full professor of church history at Erlangen. He has written: *Der Kanzler Brück und seine Bedeutung für die Entwicklung der Reformation* (Gotha, 1874); *Luthers Stellung zu Konzil und Kirche bis zum Wormser Reichstag* (Gütersloh, 1876); *Die deutsche Augustiner-Congregation und Johann von Staupitz* (Gotha, 1879); *Friedrich der Weise und die Anfänge der Reformation* (Erlangen, 1881); *Analecta Lutherana* (Gotha, 1883); *Luther und der Reichstag zu Worms* (Halle, 1883); *Martin Luther, eine Biographie* (2 vols., Gotha, 1884–93); *Die Heilsarmee nach eigener Anschauung und nach ihren Schriften* (Erlangen, 1885); *Der Methodismus und seine Bekämpfung* (1886); *Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte* (Leipsic, 1888); *Die Loci communes Philipp Melanchthons* (1890); *Luthers Selbstmord: eine Geschichtslüge P. Majunkes beleuchtet* (1890); *Ueber Grenzen des historischen Erkennens* (1890); *Die kirchlichen Brüderschaften und das religiöse Leben im modernen Katholizismus* (Erlangen, 1895); *Andreas Althamer der Humanist und Reformator* (1896); *Die Ausburger Confession lateinisch und deutsch kurz erläutert* (Gotha, 1896); *Das religiöse Leben in Erfurt beim Ausgange des Mittelalters* (Halle, 1898); *Dr. Johann Teuschbein und der erste Reformationsversuch in Rothenburg ob der Tauber* (Leipsic, 1901); *Edward Irving* (1903); *Das bayerische Religionsedikt vom 10. Jan. 1803* (Erlangen, 1903); *Der Staatsgedanke der Reformation und die römische Kirche* (Leipsic, 1903); *P. Denifle, seine Beschimpfung Luthers und der evangelischen Kirche* (1904); *Der Katholizismus und das zwanzigste Jahrhundert* (1905); *Die Anfänge einer katholischen Gemeinde in Erlangen* (Erlangen, 1906); *Die älteste Redaktion der Augsburger Konfession mit Melanchthons Einleitung* (Gütersloh, 1906); and *Historische Einleitung in die symbolischen Bücher der Evangleisch-lutherischen Kirche* (1907). He has also edited the *Beiträge zur bayerischen Kirchengeschichte* (Erlangen since 1895).

KOL NIDRE, kəl nî′drê ("All vows"): The name given to the evening service taking place in the synagogue before the beginning of the Day of Atonement, derived from the opening words. The service is opened by the formula *Kol nidre* which runs as follows: "All vows, renunciations, bans, *ḳonams* and [other] cognomens [with which vows may be designated] and *ḳinuse* and oaths, which we vow and swear and ban and bind upon our souls, from this day of atonement until the [next] day of atonement which shall come for our welfare—we repent them all; they shall be solved, remitted, abolished, be void and null, without power and without validity. May our vows be no vows, and our oaths be no oaths." Then cantor and congregations recite together Num. xv. 26. The cantor closes with an offering of thanks in that God has kept alive his praying people.

This ceremony has caused many accusations against the Jews, especially one concerning the untrustworthiness of an oath by a Jew. It is to be noted, however, that in this formula there is no allusion to oaths sworn to others, but only to obligations which one imposes upon himself. Because the Oriental, through his emotional temperament, is easily moved to make unconsidered vows, the Talmudists declared vows unmeritorious and even sinful, and some vows were declared initially invalid; others could be solved if repentance was expressed. Besides that, a general absolution of future vows was allowed by a solemn declaration on New Year's Day. In post-Talmudic times this usage was changed so that the declaration was to be made on the first evening of the day of atonement by the whole congregation and with reference to the past, not to the future.

Kol nidre is first mentioned in the time of the Geonim (589–1034 A.D.) It was only slowly that the formula was recognized and expanded. Even in the twelfth century and later it was rejected by men like Jehuda Hadassi (c. 1148); Isaac ben Sheshet of Saragossa (d. c. 1406); Jacob Landau (flourished c. 1480 in Italy) in a collection of ritualistic decrees called Agur; and Mordecai ben Abraham Jaffe (d. Mar. 7, 1612), rabbi in Poland and in Prague. Kol nidre was abolished in Mecklenburg-Schwerin in May, 1844, in Hanover at the end of the sixties, and still later in Magdeburg. There was substituted either a German hymn or a new Hebrew prayer; but the majority of "orthodox" congregations, in Germany, Austria-Hungary and other countries, adhered to the early formula.

An important change in the formula was made by Meïr ben Samuel (d. after 1135). Up to his time the solution of the vows of the past year had been pronounced, but he allowed the vows of the year just begun to be declared invalid. This restitution of the original idea was widely adopted, especially in the German ritual. See also OATH; and VOWS.

(H. L. STRACK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. A. Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, part ii., chap. 9, Königsberg, 1711; M. Philipson, *Ueber die Verbesserung des Judeneids*, Neustrelitz, 1797; Z. Frankel, *Die Eidesleistung der Juden*, Dresden, 1840; L. Zunz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, ii. 241–264, Berlin, 1876; L. Löw, *Gesammelte Schriften*, iii. 359–366, Szegedin, 1893. Consult also Lehmann, in *Der Israelit*, 1863, nos. 25, 38.

KOMANDER, kō-mān′der **(DORFMANN), JOHANN:** Reformer of the canton of Grisons; b. at Maienfeld (12 m. n. of Chur); d. at Chur early in 1557. He studied at Basel with Zwingli in 1502–1503, was settled as pastor in Chur as early as 1523, and was active there till his death. Though the Reformation had made considerable progress in the vicinity of Chur, Komander met with violent opposition at first, but Zwingli's influence induced the authorities of the town to protect him. Forty other preachers joined his cause. The papal party, however, found in 1525 a peculiar ally in the Anabaptists. Theodor Schlegel, the clever abbot of St. Lucius in Chur, secretly favored the Anabaptists, and then at the federal diet in 1525 accused Komander and his friends as the instigators of their heresy. Komander calmly and courageously requested the council to let him justify his faith from Holy Scripture. A religious colloquy was ordered at Ilanz on Jan. 7, 1526, for which Komander prepared eighteen theses on the basis of Zwingli's theses for the first disputation of Zurich. The colloquy lasted two days, but only the first thesis on the authority of the Bible was discussed, all further efforts being frustrated by the intrigues of Schlegel. On the whole, the result of the colloquy was favorable to the Reformation; the authority of Komander increased, and seven other clergymen of Grisons joined his cause. But under pressure from the Roman strongholds in the confederation, and to free certain respected Evangelical citizens of the Valtellina (q. v.) who had been captured by Roman noblemen, the federal diet, assembled in 1526 at Chur, resolved to maintain the old usages in regard to public worship, although preaching was to remain free. Soon after the issue of this decree, some Evangelical preachers were banished for refusing to restore the mass and images. Nevertheless, Komander ventured to expound the Evangelical doctrine of the Lord's Supper at Easter, 1526, and it was administered according to Evangelical rite in 1527. Soon afterward the odious decree was revoked, and freedom of choice between the two conflicting religions was permitted. An *Artikelbrief*, favorable to the Evangelicals, was issued June 25, 1526. It gave the congregations the right to choose their own pastors, restricted the rights of patronage of the cathedral chapter, and forbade the election of a bishop without the consent of the federal diet. Irritated by these decisions, the bishop and Schlegel entered into treasonable relations with the Medici; but the conspiracy was discovered, the bishop was exiled, and Schlegel was beheaded in 1529.

After the outward security of the Reformation had been achieved, Komander busied himself with its internal development. Zwingli gave him an excellent assistant in Nicolaus Baling. Komander learned Hebrew, and studied so diligently that he injured his eyesight. From his correspondence with Zwingli, it is evident that he had many disagreeable encounters with the Anabaptists. He was a genuine disciple of Zwingli, and was always in close relation with his friends at Zurich. In agreement with Bullinger, he proposed at the federal diet of 1536 a firmer organization of the Church. This idea was realized in 1537 by the institution of a synod. The catechism of Grisons is Komander's work, and he took a prominent part in the composition of the *Confessio Rhaetica*, which was chiefly directed against Antitrinitarian heresies. In the latter years of his life he devoted his efforts to the development of the high school at Chur, founded in 1539, which soon began to flourish under Johannes Pontisella and Simon Lemnius. Komander's last public appearance was in a fiery discourse delivered before the federal diet in 1556 against the sending of a submissive embassy to the pope.

(B. RIGGENBACH†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The sources and treatment of Komander are best sought in the literature cited under ZWINGLI, e.g., Zwingli's *Opera*, vols. vii.–viii.; R. Staehelin, *Huldreich Zwingli*, 2 vols., Basel, 1895–97; S. M. Jackson, *Huldreich Zwingli*, New York, 1903 (consult Index "Comander"); and the literature under REFORMATION in the section on Switzerland. Consult: U. Campell, *Hist. Raetica*, ed. P. Plattner, 2 vols., Basel, 1886–90; F. Trechsel, *Die protestantischen Antitrinitarier*, vol. ii., Heidelberg, 1844; H. G. Sulzberger, *Geschichte der Reformation im Kanton Graubünden*, Chur, 1880; Schaff, *Christian Church*, vii. 138–140; *Bullingers Korrespondenz* in *Quellen zur Schweizer Geschichte*, vol. xxiii., Basel, 1904; E. Blösch, *Geschichte der schweizerisch-reformierten Kirche*, i. 55 sqq., 176 sqq., Bern, 1898. For the colloquy at Ilanz, cf. J. C. Füssli, *Beiträge zur Kirchen- und Reformationsgeschichte*, i. 337–382, Zurich, 1741; U. Campell, ut sup., ii. 287–308; *Hofmeisters Akten zum Religionsgespräch in Ilanz*, Chur, 1904.

KOOLHAAS, kōl′hās, **KASPAR JANSZOON:** Dutch Protestant; b. at Cologne Jan. 24, 1536; d. at Amsterdam Jan. 15, 1615. After a few years of study at Cologne and Düsseldorf, he joined the Carthusians at Coblenz, but in 1560 entered the Protestant ministry at Marbach, and in 1566 became pastor at Deventer, Holland. When the city fell into the hands of the Spaniards he fled to Germany, but returned to Holland in 1573 and became pastor at Leyden in 1574. At the founding of the university there he delivered the opening address. In a quarrel between the government and the consistory he defended the rights of the government in ecclesiastical affairs. In his opinion the Church assumed too many rights and curtailed freedom of thought. The ministers of the classis of South Holland now forbade him to preach. As his views on predestination differed from those of the stricter Calvinists an accusation was presented against him at the Synod of Middelburg in 1581, and in 1582 he was excommunicated at the Synod of Haarlem, though this excommunication was soon annulled. On account of the continued opposition of the clergy he finally withdrew from the Church and earned his living as a distiller. He was a follower of Luther, rather than of Calvin. For his opposition to the restrictions placed upon the Church by ecclesiastical formularies he must be regarded as a forerunner of Arminius and the Remonstrants. (H. C. Rogge†.)

Bibliography: H. C. Rogge, *Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes, de voorlooper van Arminius en der Remonstranten*, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1856–58.

KOPP, GEORG: German cardinal; b. at Duderstadt (15 m. e. of Göttingen) July 27, 1837. He studied at the Gymnasium of Hildesheim, and after being a telegrapher in the service of the Hanoverian government (1856–58) studied theology at the episcopal seminary in Hildesheim (1858–61). In 1862 he was ordained to the priesthood, and was then vicar of a school at Henneckenrode and curate at Detfurt until 1865, when he became assistant to the vicar-general at Hildesheim. In 1870 he was created apostolic prothonotary, and in 1872 became a member of the chapter of the cathedral at Hildesheim and vicar-general of the diocese. In 1881 he was consecrated bishop of Fulda, and in 1887 became prince-bishop of Breslau. In 1893 he was created cardinal-priest of Santa Agnese fuori le Mura. He was a member of the Prussian house of deputies in 1884–1886, and since 1886 has been a member of the upper house. He is a domestic prelate of the pope.

Bibliography: *Der Papst, die Regierung, und die Verwaltung der heiligen Kirche in Rom*, pp. 185, 187–188, Munich, 1904.

KORAH, kō′rā, **KORAHITES:** Names which appear in three connections in the Old Testament: (1) As an Edomitic stock or clan (Gen. xxxvi. 5, 14, 16, 18; I Chron. i. 35); (2) as a family (or city) belonging to the descendants of Caleb, reckoned as Judahites (I Chron. ii. 43 and perhaps I Chron. xii. 6); (3) most frequently as descendants of Levi, belonging to the family of Kohath in the genealogies of Ex. vi. 21, 24; I Chron. vi. 22, ix. 15, xxvi. 1. Num. xxvi. 58 departs from the usual division of the Levi stock into three branches and makes the Korahite family one of five. Num. xvi.–xvii. deals with the Kohathite Korah in connection with the rebellion of Dathan and Abiram; the Chronicler makes the Korahites doorkeepers of the sanctuary (I Chron. ix. 19, 26, 31). The Korahites appear also in the superscriptions of Ps. xlii., xliv.–xlix., lxxxiv., lxxxv., lxxxvii., lxxxviii.

Of special importance is the passage Num. xvi.–xvii., formerly thought to be a unit, but shown by Kuenen to be composed of three narratives woven together and differing in their representations. J makes Dathan and Abiram the opponents of the leadership of Moses, P makes Korah the representative of the laity against Moses and Aaron who stand for the priesthood, while the third element regards Korah as a non-priestly Levite who champions the cause of the Levites against the exclusive priestly claims of the Aaronites. Evidently the Korah of these chapters is the Korah of (3) above (cf. Num. xxvi. 11); P must have regarded Korah as a Levite, and the editor evidently had a pragmatic aim in combining the narratives. Difficulties arise regarding the historicity of the P narrative, though traditional material is employed. Two Korahs—(2) and (3) above—may have been confused in the combination, but from all passages cited above no secure history of the family can be deduced.

In clearer but not altogether consistent form is the Levitical relationship of the Korahitic Levites set forth in Chronicles and in the priest code. The former (I., ix. 19) regards the Korahites as doorkeepers of the sanctuary; the latter gives them more minute and particular temple service (Num. iii. 31). In the older parts of Ezra-Nehemiah the singers and doorkeepers are not reckoned to the Levites but are a special division. The Sons of Korah of the inscriptions of the Psalms appear in Chronicles as doorkeepers, not as singers. Yet in II Chron. xx. 19 the Kohathites and Korahites appear as singers, and I Chron. vi. 18 sqq. makes Heman to be of Kohathite stock, while I Chron. ix. 33 closes the preceding list of Levites with the words "and these are the singers." Thus the line between doorkeepers and singers is not sharply drawn by the Chronicler, and the title of the Psalms cited, "for the Sons of Korah," does not find satisfactory support in Chronicles and appears to be based on some variant system. It is hardly probable, however, that a new gild of singers was organized in times after the Chronicles to which the name "sons of Korah" was given; possibly this designation was a collective term embracing the doorkeepers and the singers and was used in the Greek period, to which Ps. xliv. belongs.

(F. Buhl.)

Bibliography: W. von Baudissin, *Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Priestertums*, Leipsic, 1889; A. Kuenen, *ThT*, xii (1878), 139 sqq.; B. W. Bacon, *Triple Tradition of the Exodus*, pp. 190 sqq., Hartford, 1894; J. Köberle, *Die Tempelsänger im A. T.*, pp. 182 sqq., Erlangen, 1899; J. E. Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby, *Composition of the Hexateuch*, ii. 212 sqq., London, 1902; Smith, *OTJC*, pp. 204 sqq.; Driver, *Introduction*, pp. 59–61; *DB*, iii. 11–12; *EB*, ii. 2686–88; *JE*, vii. 556–567; and, in general, literature on the Hexateuch.

KORAN. See Mohammed, Mohammedanism.

KOREA.

I. The Land and People.
  Extent, Climate, Resources (§ 1).
  Government and Recent History (§ 2).
II. Missions.
  Roman Catholic Missions (§ 1).
  Protestant Missions (§ 2).
  Results (§ 3).

I. The Land and People: Korea comprises the peninsula lying between Japan and Chinese Asia. The name by which the country was known to its inhabitants when first opened by treaty to foreign entrance was Cho-sen, "Morning-calm," later changed to Tai-han. The term Korea comes from Korai, Korye, or Koryu, the name of the strongest of three kingdoms which existed in the country in the tenth century. From the fact that foreigners were until toward the end of the nineteenth century not allowed to enter or reside in the land, Korea became poetically known as the "Hermit Nation." The peninsula runs approximately north and south, having the Sea of Japan on the east, the Strait of Korea on the south, the Yellow Sea on the west, while Russian and Chinese territory bound it on the north. If the dictionary definition of an island be

1. Extent, Climate, Resources.

accepted, Korea would more probably be termed an island, for the small lake situated on the slopes of "the ever white mountain" in the north is the source of two rivers, the Tumen, which empties into the Sea of Japan, and the Yaloo which finds its way into the Yellow Sea, the northern boundary being therefore entirely of water, making of Korea a body of land entirely surrounded by water. The length of the country from north to south is about 700 miles, and it has an area variously estimated as between 80,000 and 92,000 square miles, approximately that of the States of New York and Pennsylvania combined, with a population estimated at about twelve millions. A chain of mountains running from north to south divides, when about three-fourths of the length of the peninsula has been traversed, into two ranges which run along the whole eastern coast and are the sources of many rapid, turbulent streams pouring into the Sea of Japan, and of several less rapid but larger rivers which, flowing placidly through the plains to the west coast, make of Korea a fertile country, producing all kinds of cereals, though rice is the staple product and the main article of diet. The climate is not unlike that of the Eastern States; for although the capital, Seoul, is as far south as Richmond, Va., the cold ocean current that flows down between Japan and Korea very much modifies the climate of the peninsula. With the exception of some six weeks of rain, during what is commonly known as the rainy season, the climate is, in the main, dry and healthful, warm in summer, and quite cold in winter, with of course the varying degrees that come from an extreme length north to south of about 1,000 miles. The mineral deposits in Korea are large and varied, silver, tin, lead and copper being found in paying quantities, and still larger deposits of gold and coal have been found. It is not, however, the El Dorado that some have claimed it to be. The people are inferior neither mentally nor physically to other Orientals. A people which has preserved its ancient civilization and so long succeeded in maintaining itself as a hermit nation might be expected to show peculiar and excellent qualities, and these have appeared and have been emphasized especially among the converts to Christianity.

2. Government and Recent History.

Korea is a limited monarchy of the paternal type, with a written constitution limiting the power of the monarch and in a manner guiding the administration of the government. During a considerable period Korea was tributary to China, but this position as a tribute-paying country in no way affected its independence in internal government. The United States recognized this independence when it made its treaty with Korea in 1882. The question of independence was, however, constantly arising, and was a matter of no little controversy until the close of the China-Japan war, when, by the treaty of peace, the independence of Korea became a recognized fact. Japan at this time gained the ascendency in the little peninsula; but she failed to use her power wisely and soon lost all influence, and Russian predominance became a fact. At the opening of the Japan-Russian war, a treaty of alliance between Japan and Korea was signed, by which, in payment for the privilege of being permitted freely to transport her troops across Korean territory, Japan guaranteed in perpetuity to maintain the independence of Korea, and the dignity of the reigning family. However, immediately after the close of this war, after the treaty of Portsmouth, Japan assumed an entirely different attitude toward Korea, and, taking the place of a conqueror rather than an ally, has attempted to maintain this position ever since. A forced treaty of protection was nominally passed by the cabinet and put into effect, since the foreign powers by their withdrawal of the legations acknowledged their willingness to yield to Japan's request. The emperor protested against this, and having in 1907 sent an embassy to The Hague in order to bring the matter to the attention of the civilized powers, Japan compelled the abdication of the emperor, had his eldest son put on the throne, and his youngest son proclaimed crown prince. At the present time, while there is nominally an emperor in Korea, the government is administered by a Japanese "resident" at Seoul, with a large force of Japanese constabulary and soldiery, and "under-residents" at a number of prominent points, though Japan still nominally maintains that Korea is independent.

II. Missions: The missionaries on their first arrival declared the people irreligious because they found a scarcity of temples and shrines, and even such temples as they had were not crowded by devotees as in some neighboring lands. They soon found that the people would announce that those things were good enough for women and children, but that the educated of the land seemed to have no faith in any one of their ancient religions, Shamanism, Buddhism, or Confucianism. Shamanism had the strongest hold, but even this was losing its grip upon the people. The natural conclusion that they were irreligious has been revised upon a closer acquaintance. Their religious instincts, coupled with their own power of reasoning, have led the people to reject successively, in large measure, all their ancient faiths, and as a result there is presented before the world a people ready and waiting for the truth. Given such a people, Christianity might be expected speedily to take root and flourish, and such has been the history of the Christian faith.

Roman Catholicism early reached Korea. Although at the time of the Hideyoshi invasion, 1592–1597, Roman Catholic Christians and some priests followed in the wake of the Japanese army, at this time there appears no trace of any definite results, or in fact of any real attempt at the propagation of Christianity. In 1777, however, the attention of a young Korean was drawn toward some Roman Catholic books, and, securing a position in the embassy to China, he attempted to find out more about the faith, and returning in 1782 to the capital, was soon actively engaged in propagating the new religion. The vital truths as presented by these Christians soon took hold upon the Korean people, and the history of early Roman Catholicism

1. Roman Catholic Missions.

in the hermit nation is almost like a romance. It was not, however, allowed to progress freely, and at the close of that century, as well as at different times during the first half of the nineteenth century, persecution broke out and threatened the life of the infant church. Many of the Koreans, however, remained firm, and, despite all persecutions and opposition, the progress was steady and constant. The latest of these severe persecutions occurred in 1866. Many attempts had been made from the very beginning of this work to introduce French priests, but this failed until 1835, after which in various guises and by various means, from time to time they entered Korea. Many of them suffered martyrdom, a notably large number met death in 1866. Roman Catholicism, however, did not give the Bible. It gave very little enlightenment outside of a few catechisms, and did not seem to lend itself to education and the general uplift of the people. There are still, however, in Korea a large number of Roman Catholics, and their figures total up to approximately 40,000.

2. Protestant Missions.

Protestant Christianity made several attempts to enter the land. Notable was the effort of the intrepid pioneer, Gutzlaff, who landed from native boats on Korean soil, and sold copies of Scriptures and tracts in the Spanish language as early as 1832. Missionaries in China were also quite concerned about their near neighbor, Korea, and the Rev. Dr. Thompson, of the London Mission School, was at his own earnest request permitted to make the attempt. He had learned the language, and just as he was ready to leave he was offered free passage if he would act as interpreter on the ill-fated ship "Sherman," and while there is no definite data to prove it, it is generally conceded that he was, with the others, massacred by the Koreans when the ship stranded in Pyeng-Yang. The treaty made by Japan with Korea in 1876, followed by the first treaty with a western power, that with the United States, made by Admiral (then Commodore) Shufeldt, of the United States Navy, opened Korea at last to the residence of missionaries. In the spring of 1884, J. W. Heron, M.D., of Tennessee was commissioned as the first missionary from a Protestant Church to the hermit nation. In June of the same year, the same board also appointed Rev. H. G. Underwood. Dr. H. N. Allen, stationed in Shanghai at the time, was transferred to Korea, and he, reaching Seoul with his family in the fall of 1884, became the first resident Protestant missionary. Just prior to Dr. Allen's arrival, however, Rev. R. S. McClay, D.D., of the Methodist Church, had been commissioned by his board to visit Korea, and make arrangements for the establishment of a mission in Seoul. He was warmly welcomed by the authorities, and was invited to establish medical and educational institutions in the country. Reporting this to his board they at once took action, and appointed the Rev. H. G. Appenzeller, and Wm. B. Scranton, M.D., while the Women's Foreign Missionary Society of the same church appointed Mrs. M. F. Scranton as their representative. Thus it may be seen that these two churches began their mission work in Korea at practically the same time, and to a large extent upon these same missions has devolved the bulk of the work during the past years. Very early in the history of the work, the missionaries were led to adopt what might be thought quite stringent rules, looking toward self-support. The many principles underlying these rules were: (1) to develop church missionary work only so fast as the natives were able to take care of it; (2) to plan church architecture along native lines; (3) to insist that the natives erect their own churches; (4) that native Evangelists be employed only so far as the natives were able to pay for them, and that the responsibility for the salvation of their neighbors be placed upon the native Christians.

3. Results.

Not only was Korea opened politically by the treaties that had been made, but in a marvelous way the missionaries seemed from the beginning to have entrance to the hearts of the people, and although there was no small amount of initiatory work to be undertaken, a literature to be prepared, the Bible to be translated, etc., yet from opening of work results in the way of conversions have been manifest. Although the first missionary, a physician, did not arrive until the summer of 1884, and the first clerical missionary in 1885, yet the first convert was baptized in July, 1886, and before the close of 1887 there were two regularly organized churches in Korea. Steadily the work has been going forward at increasing speed, gathering momentum as it advanced, until for some years past the speed at which the advance has been made has far exceeded the ability of the missionaries to keep up with it. The latest reports concerning the work for all denominations show considerably over 1,000 native churches with more than 120,000 Christians, and these Christians maintain, almost wholly at their own expense, over 500 schools for the education of the sons of the church. Students of the times believe that if the opportunities presented in Korea are met, this will be the first of modern eastern nations to become Christian.

The churches working there at the present time are the American Presbyterian North, the American Presbyterian Church South, The Methodist Episcopal, the Southern Methodist, the Canadian Presbyterian, the Australian Presbyterian, and the Church of England. As each of the Presbyterian churches has opened up work, it has united with the other Presbyterian forces and from the very beginning, ecclesiastically, these churches have been one. This oneness was crystallized in September, 1907, by the organization of the Presbyterians in Korea for their work there under authority derived from the four general assemblies. The two Methodist churches also work in harmony, and while at the present time ecclesiastically they are not yet united, it is expected that union will take place. There are those who are hoping for a still greater union, that of Methodists with Presbyterians, whereby the unity of the Church of Christ may be practically demonstrated to the people of Korea.

H. G. UNDERWOOD.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best work for a historical survey and at the same time for a view of the people and their cus-

toms is W. E. Griffis, *Corea the Hermit Nation*, 8th ed., New York, 1907. Perhaps the best view of the Korean is given in J. S. Gale's *Vanguard*, ib. 1904; cf. the same author's *Korean Sketches*, Edinburgh, 1898. Consult further: P. Lowell, *Chosön, The Land of Morning Calm*, Boston, 1885; W. R. Carles, *Life in Corea*, London, 1888; G. W. Gilmore, *Korea from its Capital*, Philadelphia, 1892; D. L. Gifford, *Everyday Life in Korea*, New York, 1898; A. Hamilton, *Korea*, ib. 1904; Mrs. L. H. Underwood, *Fifteen Years among the Topknots*, ib. 1904; *With Tommy Tompkins in Korea*, ib. 1905; H. B. Hulbert, *Hist. of Korea*, 2 vols., London, 1906; idem, *The Passing of Korea*, New York, 1906 (strongly antagonistic to Japan), with which should be compared G. T. Ladd, *In Korea with Marquis Ito*, ib. 1908 (with strong bias in favor of Japan, deeply antagonistic if not unfair to Korea); G. H. Jones, *Korea, Land, People, and Customs*, Cincinnati, 1907; H. G. Underwood, *The Call of Korea*, New York, 1908; F. A. McKenzie, *The Tragedy of Korea*, London, 1908.

KORESHAN ECCLESIA, KORESHAN UNITY. See COMMUNISM, II., 4.

KORNTHAL.

A Center of Pietism (§ 1).
Foundation of the Community (§ 2).
Doctrine, Government (§ 3).
The First Pastorate (§ 4).
Subsequent History (§ 5).

1. A Center of Pietism. Kornthal, a small village near Stuttgart, is noteworthy as the center of Württemberg Pietism. In Württemberg the Pietistic movement, though inspired by Spener and Francke, had retained its individuality, thanks to its nonpolemic and popular character and the greater learning of its theological representatives. It also far outlived its Halle counterpart, reaching its acme in the second half of the eighteenth century. It arose under the influence of Johann Michael Hahn (q.v.) who renewed the speculations of Jakob Boehme (q.v.) and gave the Pietistic laity a higher sense of their religious independence. This feeling was increased both by their union with the Christentumsgesellschaft (q.v.) in Basel and by the rise of a school of Biblical supernaturalism. If the latter factor was a distinct weakening of the strict adherence to the Bible taught by J. A. Bengel (q.v.), a further impulse toward decay was given by the rationalizing policy of Frederick I. His oppressive measures, including a rather rationalistic agenda in 1809 and the denial of the right of congregations to refuse unpleasing pastors in 1810, roused an antagonism among the Pietists which was augmented not only by the Swabian tendency to cling to traditional views, but also by their acceptance of Bengel's chiliastic theories, which prophesied the coming of the Millennium in 1836. Partly following the example of the Harmonists (see COMMUNISM, II., 6), thousands of Pietists emigrated to southern Russia, their exodus being aided by the repeal of the emigration-laws by William I. on Frederick's death. William sought to stay such emigration, and on Feb. 14, 1817, issued directions to all civil authorities urging them to dissuade would-be emigrants from carrying out their intentions. In reply, the burgomaster of Leonberg, Gottlieb Wilhelm Hoffmann, suggested to the king that as the emigrants sought only religious freedom, they would readily remain if they were permitted to establish congregations which, although independent of the ecclesiastical authorities, would not be essentially severed from the Lutheran Church, whose doctrines they held. This response of Hoffmann, himself a leader both in Pietism and in political affairs, led the king to request him (Apr. 1) to draw up a scheme for the creation of such congregations; and the burgomaster accordingly formulated a plan (Apr. 14) avowedly based on the Moravian model.

2. Foundation of the Community. On Sept. 8, 1818, a royal decree permitted the formation of a religious community, and on Jan. 12, 1819, Kornthal was purchased, the oratory of the community being dedicated Nov. 7, 1819. In all these transactions Hoffmann acted in concert with other Pietistic leaders, particularly with Hahn, who was chosen leader of the new community, but died immediately after the purchase of Kornthal. Yet the very presence of such a man implied that the early purpose of the community was widened, and it was no longer its sole intent to protect Lutheranism from the rationalizing influence of ecclesiastical authorities, but to form a body of the truly converted—the keynote of Pietism from its beginning. A certain opposition to the Church developed, partly because a layman was at the head of the new organization, partly because of an ascetic and legalistic tendency in Hahn, combined with the belief in the immediate Second Advent, for which preparation could rightly be made only by gathering together the faithful. Nor was a degree of separatism displeasing to Hoffmann, who throughout his life regarded the Church as an obstacle to all progress of the kingdom of God. Under Moravian influence, he sought especially to make the community a model in industrial undertakings and to render it influential over the people through educational institutions.

3. Doctrine, Government. To show the harmony of the new body with the established Church, the Augsburg Confession was formally adopted, though the rejection of the *secus docentes* was omitted, and a special paragraph was drawn up expressing abhorrence of all religious intolerance. While, however, the community was not subject to the consistory, but only to the minister of public worship, its adherence to the old ecclesiastical books was not emphasized as clearly as might have been expected. Yet even this was in entire conformity with its Pietistic basis, with its ideal of an apostolic life and the realization of the Sermon on the Mount. This is shown by the program prepared by Hahn in 1817, with its insistence on ecclesiastical discipline, particularly in admission of and exclusion from the community. These latter features, however, involved both legal and ethical problems, the former arising primarily from the economic principles of the community, and the latter from the possible contingency of the breaking up of families because of variance in religious views. On the other hand, they were readily relieved from the obligation to military service or to take oath. The community was empowered to call a regular clergyman who should also inspect schools, etc., and should, in this capacity, be subject to the State Church, though the community was to appoint teachers and choose religious textbooks for the schools. A specifically Pietistic trait was the requirement that laymen should have the right to edify the community, except in the regular religious services. The discipline extended even to clothing, food, and reading; but the basis of it all was chiliasm, seen even in the flimsy construction of the houses, so soon was the Second Advent expected. A third motive in the establishment of the community, besides the desire to escape rationalism and to create a pure congregation, was the foundation, again borrowed from the Moravians, of a missionary institute and a printing-press. The latter, like Hoffmann's plans for the community's industrial enterprise, came to naught; the former, on the other hand, by the erection of one of the first refuges for destitute children, was a first step in home missions.

4. The First Pastorate. The first pastor of the community of Kornthal was Friedrich formerly at Winzerhausen, a chiliast, who was called in 1819. Hoffmann, however, still remained the civil head. In these early years the basal principles of the community were still strong. Its foundation had called forth a flood of pamphlets, and evoked not only the wrath of the rationalists, but the suspicions of the supernaturalists—the natural result being to increase the enthusiasm of the members of the community and their friends. The settlement became a sort of place of pilgrimage both for other Pietists and for earnest Christians, as well as for mere curiosity-seekers. Yet, despite this mass of religious enthusiasts, there were no manifestations of fanaticism, owing to the governing genius of Hoffmann. He was now endeavoring to establish a second colony, but meanwhile the opposition of the government had increased. King William, however, mindful of the economic advantages of such communities, and desiring to transform a marshy district of Upper Swabia into fertile land by the industry of the Pietists, offered them this region. Hoffmann did not dare to reject it, and in 1824 the community of Wilhelmsdorf was founded in the midst of Roman Catholic Upper Swabia. It was a heavy burden for the parent colony, and was joined only by the poorest members, who went not as a privilege, but as a sacrifice. Wilhelmsdorf struggled on, however, until 1852, when it formally separated from Kornthal, though it is still exempt from the consistory.

5. Subsequent History. After Friedrich's death in 1827 there was an interim until 1833, when Kapff was called as his successor. The fact that he belonged to the State Church minimized the antagonism between the community and the Church. Non-members were admitted to confirmation and the Lord's Supper; and as the remembrance of their earlier grievances against the State Church faded away, the danger of religious extravagance vanished under Kapff's guidance, while the quiet course of 1836, the year set by Bengel for the Second Advent, dampened chiliastic hopes. On the other hand, between 1831 and 1848, the decay of rationalism was replaced by the warmth of Pietism within the State Church, to which Von Kapff himself returned in 1843. The reason for the existence of the community thus became somewhat questionable, and since 1848 its religious significance has in a great measure vanished. Nevertheless, the third pastor, J. H. Staudt, who presided over the community from 1843 to 1882, was able not only to preserve Kornthal's individuality, but also to make it a center for Pietists and even for wider circles. At the same time, he kept the community from adopting schemes at variance with its original purpose. Between his successor, however, and a portion of the community a conflict arose, which was settled only by the aid of the consistory. The position of the community has become more difficult as a result of recent legislation. The laws of Nov. 1, 1867, granting unrestricted domicile, of July 3, 1869, on the civil equality of confessions, and of June 16, 1885, on membership in communities, have abrogated its privilege to prohibit undesirable elements from citizenship. The result, as in the analogous case of the State Church, has been the strengthening of the moral power of the community; and in 1892 both Kornthal and Wilhelmsdorf passed a sanctioned agenda empowering them to preserve the character of their membership by exclusively ecclesiastical regulations. The present significance of the community, which now numbers about 1,200, is essentially that of a refuge for those who, wearied of struggle, long for a peaceful and spiritual atmosphere. (C. KOLB.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: S. C. Kapff, *Die württembergischen Brüdergemeinden Kornthal und Wilhelmsdorf*, Kornthal, 1839; C. Palmer, *Gemeinschaften und Sekten Württembergs*, ed. Jetter, Tübingen, 1877; H. Schmidt, *Die innere Mission in Württemberg*, pp. 52 sqq., Hamburg, 1879; further literature in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xi. 38–39.

KORTHOLT, CHRISTIAN: German Lutheran; b. at Borg, on the island of Femern or Fehmarn (in the Baltic Sea), Holstein, Jan. 15, 1632; d. at Kiel Mar. 31 (Apr. 1), 1694. He studied at the universities of Rostock, Jena, Leipsic, and Wittenberg, became professor of Greek at Rostock in 1662 and professor of theology and prochancellor at the newly founded University of Kiel in 1666. He owed his fame not so much to his church history published after his death (*Historia ecclesiastica Novi Testamenti*, Leipsic, 1697), as to some excellent monographs, for instance, on the first persecutions of the Christians (*De persecutionibus ecclesiæ primitivæ sub imperatoribus ethnicis*, Jena, 1660, Kiel, 1689) and on the literary opponents of Christianity (*Paganus obtrectator, sive de calumniis gentilium, libri iii*, Kiel, 1698). He was also one of the first Protestant theologians who undertook to refute Baronius (*Disquisitiones Anti-Baronianæ*, 1700). He was in harmony with the Pietists, and was the personal friend of Spener and Francke.

(PAUL TSCHACKERT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Gedächtnisrede*, by his son-in-law Lindemann, is in H. Pipping, *Memoriæ theologorum ætatis*, pp. 57 sqq., Leipsic, 1705.

KOSTERS, WILLEM HENDRIK: Dutch theologian and Old-Testament scholar; b. at Enschede (78 m. e. of Utrecht) Oct. 3, 1843; d. at Leyden Dec. 19, 1897. He was the son of Dr. Jan Kosters, a physician of some repute; received his preliminary education in the schools of his native town; entered the University of Leyden as a student in theology in 1861, ending his course in 1868 and taking his doctorate with a dissertation on Deuteronomy compared with Genesis and Exodus; while there he was greatly influenced by Kuenen, whose successor he later became. He assumed the pastorate at Rockanye 1874, at Heenobet 1874, at Barendrecht 1877, at Neede 1880, and at Deventer 1883; in 1892 he succeeded Kuenen as professor at Leyden. In his pastorate he made himself greatly beloved by his interest in the poor and the sick, while at the same time he was an excellent preacher, applying to his work the results of a wide reading. In his chair as a university teacher he was happy and successful, delivering at his inauguration an address on *Het godsdienstig Karakter van Israels Historiografie* (Leyden, 1892). Notwithstanding the engrossing character of his duties in preparing his lectures, he collaborated in the editing of the *Theologische Tijdschrift*, contributing much of his own work to its columns; he was the author also of *Het Herstel van Israel in het perzische Tijdvak* (Leyden, 1893); the views advanced in this book are embodied in the volume on Ezra-Nehemiah in the Century Bible (London 1909). The views for which he was most noted are that the " return " which appears in the account of Ezra and Nehemiah never really took place; that the temple was built not by returning exiles but by the Jews who were on the spot and had never gone into exile; and that the reform of Ezra followed and not preceded that of Nehemiah—in the last point following Van Hoonacker of Louvain and other scholars. These positions have been accepted in the main by a considerable number of Old-Testament scholars, though not by the majority. T. WITTON DAVIES.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. Oor, *Levensbericht van Willem Hendrik Kosters*, Leyden, 1898.

KOTTWITZ, kɵt′wîts, **HANS ERNST, BARON VON:** Philanthropist; b. in Tschepplau, near Glogau (55 m. n.w. of Breslau), Silesia, Sept. 2 (or 1), 1757; d. at Berlin May 13, 1843. The facts of his life have to be gathered from a few letters and the biographies of others, and events before he settled at Berlin in 1807 and became a public personality are veiled in obscurity. He received his education in an institution of Breslau. Later he came to the court of Frederick II. as page. About this time he had a quarrel with his parents and decided to emigrate, but an order of the sovereign, issued at the instigation of his father, compelled him to stay. After the death of his father in 1777, Hans Ernst, as his only surviving son, was probably charged with the administration of his estate. Of the following thirty years nothing is known except his marriage, his entrance into the order of the freemasons, his conversion, the beginnings of his philanthropic work in Silesia, various travels, and perhaps also his divorce. The unfortunate outcome of his marriage was probably occasioned by his liberality in the cause of philanthropy, which sometimes seems to have bordered on imprudence, especially from the practical standpoint of his wife. It is not known in what relation Kottwitz stood to the Unity of Brethren (Moravians), but it is certain that he attained peace of soul and his religious convictions by contact with this sect; Bishop Spangenberg especially influenced him deeply, according to his own statement. His relations with the freemasons date probably from the time before his conversion, and it was undoubtedly their philanthropic efforts that attracted him.

Kottwitz took Exodus vi. 9 as the basis of his life-work, being of the opinion that misery of the body depresses the human spirit, and that the tears of earthly pain must be dried before the realization of spiritual needs can come to the poor and unhappy. For this purpose he undertook extensive travels over several states of Germany such as Silesia, the mark of Brandenburg, Sleswick, Holstein, Mecklenburg, and Pomerania, and founded factories in Silesia after his own ideals and an institution for voluntary occupation in opposition to the compulsory work of the houses of correction at Berlin. Both kinds of institutions were based on the principle of self-help and self-respect. Kottwitz intended to discourage begging and at the same time remove poverty by providing remunerative labor. The poor working men in Silesia were mostly weavers. He distributed material among them, paid for their work generously and sold their productions, often with great sacrifices of his own fortune. In 1807 he removed to Berlin, just at a time when there was great misery among the working classes on account of the war with Napoleon. Here he founded institutions similar to those in Silesia and in addition provided free lodgings for whole families of working men. When a family by diligence and thrift had lifted itself out of its miserable conditions, it made way for another family. The children of these working men were provided with their own teachers, and every evening there was held a common service, consisting of song, reading of Scripture, and extempore prayer, which was conducted by Kottwitz himself or by one of his teachers. The maintenance of these institutions must have devoured immense sums of his private fortune, and it was only at a later time that the king contributed an annual sum of 3,000 thalers for the care of 120 old and invalid persons. The whole colony numbered 600. In 1823 the financial circumstances of Kottwitz compelled him to hand his foundations over to the city, but he became a member in the directorate and was allowed to keep his residence among his people. While his work on the whole failed, his intercourse with his friends and his care for individual souls remained of lasting value. In Berlin he became the acknowledged leader of the Pietists, and his colony their principal place of meeting. The circle of his friends included old and young, lawyers, army officers, and theologians, among them Jänicke, Neander, Strauss, Hengstenberg, Tholuck, Stier, Rothe, Wichern, and others. (F. BOSSE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: T. Ritter, *Erinnerungen aus dem Leben des . . . Barons von Kottwitz*, Berlin, 1857; J. L. Jacobi, *Erinnerungen an den Baron E. von Kottwitz*, Halle, 1882; W. Baur, in *Neue Christoterpe*, 1883; *ADB*, xvi. 765–772.

KRABBE, krāb′be, **OTTO KARSTEN:** German Lutheran; b. at Hamburg Dec. 27, 1805; d. at Rostock Nov. 14, 1873. He studied theology at Bonn, Berlin, and Göttingen, attending also lectures on philology, philosophy, and history. At Bonn he was influenced by Nitzsch, Sack, and Lücke; at Berlin he was in personal intercourse with Schleiermacher and especially Neander. In 1833 he was called to the Johanneum at Hamburg as professor of Biblical philology and philosophy, and in 1840 he became professor of theology at Rostock, where he remained until the end of his life. He lectured chiefly on systematic and practical theology. He was also elected preacher of the university and leader of the homiletical seminar, in 1844 a member of the theological board of examiners, and in 1851 a member of the consistory. He took a very active part in the affairs of the university, being elected six times its rector. His life-work tended throughout toward the practical side of religious and churchly life. He made it his chief task to combat rationalism in the theological faculty, and in the State Church of Mecklenburg; and he was especially in harmony with Kliefoth's efforts (see KLIEFOTH, THEODOR FRIEDRICH DETHLOF) for the reassertion of the Lutheran confession and the Lutheran church order. His most important dogmatic work is *Die Lehre von der Sünde und vom Tode in ihrer Beziehung zu einander und zu der Auferstehung Christi* (Hamburg, 1836). According to Krabbe, Schleiermacher with his doctrine of the activity of the redemption of Christ had firmly founded an essential basis of Christian conviction, but because he ignored the essence and importance of sin, he had not penetrated to an adequate understanding of atonement and redemption. Krabbe developed on the basis of the Old and New Testament the Biblical doctrines of the original condition, of the fall and its consequences, emphasizing the fact of the resurrection of Christ in its central importance. Other works are: *Vorlesungen über das Leben Jesu* (1839); *Die evangelische Landeskirche Preussens und ihre öffentlichen Rechtsverhältnisse* (Rostock, 1849); *August Neander* (Hamburg, 1852); *Die Universität Rostock im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Rostock, 1854); *Aus dem kirchlichen und ausserkirchlichen Leben Rostocks. Zur Geschichte Wallensteins und des dreissigjährigen Krieges* (Berlin, 1863); *Heinrich Müller und seine Zeit* (Rostock, 1866); *David Chytraeus* (1870); *Wider die gegenwärtige Richtung des Staatslebens im Verhältnis zur Kirche* (1873). (K. SCHMIDT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Allgemeine evangelisch-lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, 1874, pp. 99 sqq.; *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, 1874, pp. 209 sqq.

KRAFFT, ADAM: Early German Protestant; b. at Fulda 1493; d. at Marburg Sept 9, 1558. He studied at Erfurt (B.A., 1512; M.A., 1519), preached for a time at Fulda, and afterward went to Hersfeld. He then became court-preacher to Philip the Magnanimous, of Hesse, who made him superintendent at Marburg in 1526, and professor of theology in 1527. He took a prominent part in all important measures for establishing Protestantism in Hesse, and as the head of the Reformation in Hesse exerted a large influence on the history of the country. CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. W. Strieder, *Hessische Gelehrtengeschichte*, ii. 373-383, Cassel, 1782; F. W. Hassencamp, *Hessische Kirchengeschichte*, i. 76 sqq., Frankfort, 1864.

KRAFFT, JOHANN (CRATO VON CRAFFTHEIM): German physician and advocate of Protestantism; b. at Breslau Nov. 22, 1519; d. there Oct. 19, 1585. In 1534 he entered the University of Wittenberg, where he lived six years on terms of intimate friendship with Luther and Melanchthon. At the instance of the former he studied medicine at Leipsic and at Padua. After his return to Germany he was appointed physician in ordinary to his native town (1550), in 1560 to the Emperor Ferdinand I., and then successively to Maximilian II. and Rudolf II. He utilized the great confidence which he enjoyed under Emperor Maximilian for the advancement of Protestantism, continually frustrating the attempts of Bishop Hoseus and of the Jesuits to lure Maximilian to the side of the opponents of Protestantism. He was an advocate of the milder Melanchthonian tendency of German Protestantism, and opposed the stricter Lutherans under Flacius. After the overthrow of Melanchthonianism in 1574 his opponents succeeded in breaking his influence with the court. In 1581 he retired to his estate, Rückerts, near Reinerz, in the county of Glatz, but in 1583 he returned to Breslau, where he exercised a decisive influence upon the confessional change at the court of Liegnitz, Brieg, and Ohlau. (PAUL TSCHACKERT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His *Consilia et epistolæ medicinales*, ed. L. Scholz, appeared in 7 vols., Frankfort, 1671. His life was written by A. G. E. T. Henschel, Breslau, 1853. Consult further J. F. A. Gillet, *Crato von Crafftheim und seine Freunde*, 2 vols., Frankfort, 1860.

KRAFFT, JOHANN CHRISTIAN GOTTLOB LUDWIG: German Reformed minister; b. at Duisburg (15 m. n. of Düsseldorf) Dec. 12, 1784; d. at Erlangen May 15, 1845. He was educated at Duisburg, and then was for five years a private tutor in Frankfort. In 1808 he was appointed pastor of the Reformed congregation at Weeze, near Clèves, and in 1817 of that at Erlangen, where in the following year he became professor of theology in the university. For some years after his marriage (1811) his mind was filled with doubts regarding the great truths of the Gospel, but study opened his eyes, and at the time of his appointment to the pastorate at Erlangen he had become a firm Biblical supernaturalist. His conviction that Holy Scripture from beginning to end is the work of the Holy Spirit became thenceforth the basis of his theology. Exegesis and apologetics became his life-work, and his chief aim was to educate theologians thoroughly grounded in the Bible. During his professorship at Erlangen he lectured to large audiences on pastoral theology, dogmatics, New-Testament exegesis, and the history of missions, being the first German professor to discuss the last-named topic. Though he was not an exceptionally eloquent preacher, his energy and earnest faith did much to make Krafft an important factor in the revivification of the Lutheran Church of Bavaria at a period when the influence of ultra-rationalism had caused its decline. He published a treatise, *De servo et libero arbitrio* (Nuremberg, 1818), seven sermons on Isa. liii., and four on I Cor. i. 30. His *Chronologie und Harmonie der vier Evangelien* was published after his death by Dr. Burger (Erlangen, 1848). (K. GOEBEL†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. Thomasius, *Das Wiedererwachen des evangelischen Lebens in der lutherischen Kirche Bayerns*, pp. 171 sqq., Erlangen, 1867.

KRAFFT, KARL JOHANN FRIEDERICH WILHELM: German Reformed, brother of Wilhelm Ludwig Krafft; b. at Cologne Nov. 25, 1814; d. at Elberfeld Mar. 15, 1898. He was educated at the universities of Erlangen, Berlin, and Bonn (1832–1837), after which he was instructor in religion at the gymnasium at Bonn. He then held brief pastorates at Flamersheim-Grossbüllesheim near Bonn and at the Reformed Church at Hückeswagen near Lennep. In 1844, however, after a tour of Italy, he accepted a call to Düsseldorf. Here he distinguished himself as an Evangelical preacher, resisted all revolutionary tendencies in the critical years 1848–49, labored earnestly in behalf of both home and foreign missions, taught religion for five years at the Realschule of Düsseldorf, conducted the local school for girls, founded a Protestant hospital, and even found time to take part in the general inspection of churches outside the Rhein province and to engage in literary labors. In 1856 he accepted a call to the newly founded fifth pastorate of the Reformed community at Elberfeld. Except for his field service as chaplain in 1866 and 1870–71, his service here remained unbroken until his retirement on account of ill-health in 1886. Krafft's chief interest lay in the domain of the New Testament, in which he held firmly to the doctrine of inspiration, and of the church history of the Rhein province. His writings comprise: *Briefe und Dokumente aus der Zeit der Reformation* (in collaboration with W. L. Krafft; Elberfeld, 1876); *Rückblick auf die synodale Geschichte des bergischen Landes* (1878); *Geschichte der beiden Märtyrer der evangelischen Kirche, Clarenbach und Fliesteden* (1886); and *Lebensbild des Kaufmanns Daniel Hermann* (1895). (F. SIEFFERT.)

KRAFFT, WILHELM LUDWIG: German Reformed, brother of the preceding; b. at Cologne Sept. 8, 1821; d. at Bonn Mar. 11, 1898. He was educated at the universities of Bonn (1839–41) and Berlin (1841–43), and in 1844 he made a tour of Greece, Egypt, Nubia, Arabia, Sinai, and Palestine. After further study in Rome he became privat-docent in the Lutheran theological faculty at Bonn in 1846, extraordinary professor in 1850, and full professor in 1859. Here he lectured on the geography of Palestine, and later on church history. In 1863 he was made a member of the theological examining board at Münster and later was appointed to the Coblenz consistory. In 1894 he resigned from the consistory, and shortly before his death was relieved from the obligation to lecture. Besides minor contributions he published: *Die Topographie Jerusalems* (Bonn, 1846); *Die Kirchengeschichte der germanischen Völker* (Berlin, 1854), of which only the first part of the first volume appeared; *Briefe und Dokumente aus der Zeit der Reformation* (Elberfeld, 1876); and *Die deutsche Bibel vor Luther* (Bonn, 1883). (F. SIEFFERT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Bonner Zeitung*, Jan. 10, 1897.

KRANICH, krā'niH, ANTON: German Roman Catholic; b. at Süssenberg (near Heilsberg, 41 m. s.e. of Königsberg), East Prussia, Aug. 20, 1852. He studied at the Lyceum of Braunsberg (1875–1878) and the University of Würzburg (D.D., 1881), and after being *literat* at the Selecta at Wormditt (1882–84) was curate at Elbing (1884–88). He was then sub-director of the seminary for priests at Braunsberg from 1888 to 1891, became privat-docent at the lyceum of the same city in 1889, associate professor of dogmatic theology and auxiliary theological sciences in 1892, and professor of the same subjects in 1894. He has written: *Der heilige Basilius in seiner Stellung zum Filioque* (Braunsberg, 1882); *Ueber die Empfänglichkeit der menschlichen Natur für die Güter der übernatürlichen Ordnung nach der Lehre des heiligen Augustinus und des heiligen Thomas von Aquin* (Paderborn, 1892); *Die Asketik in ihrer dogmatischen Grundlage bei Basilius dem Grossen* (1896); *Ecclesia quibus de causis per se ipsa sit motivum credibilitatis et divinæ suæ legationis testimonium* (Braunsberg, 1898); *Kirche und Kirchspiel Reichenberg* (1903); and *Qua vi ac ratione Clemens Alexandrinus ethnicos ad religionem christianam adducere studuerit* (1903).

KRANTZ, krāntz, ALBERT: Historian of the fifteenth century; b. at Hamburg c. 1445 or somewhat earlier; d. there Dec. 7, 1517. He was matriculated at Rostock 1463, continued his studies at Cologne, at first being interested in law and then turning to theology and history. After extensive journeys, during which he gathered from different libraries material later utilized in his works on history, he seems to have been appointed professor at the University of Rostock, of which in 1482 be became rector and in 1486 dean of the philosophical faculty. In the same year he was appointed also syndic of the town of Lübeck. He seems to have lived at that time in Lübeck, and it is not certain whether he continued to be active at Rostock. In 1493 he became first lector of theology at the cathedral of Hamburg, and after 1500 he seems to have held also the position of syndic of Hamburg. In 1508 he became dean of the cathedral chapter and twice, in 1508 and 1514, held strict church visitations in his diocese, urging the removal of abuses and a stricter obedience to the laws of the church. In theology Krantz took the standpoint of the older Catholicism, but in some of his views reveals the beginnings of the modern spirit. He approved of Luther's vehement opposition against the abuse of indulgences, but considered the removal of them an undertaking beyond the powers of a monk. A few days before his death, as he lay on his bed, Luther's theses were brought and read to him. He then ejaculated: "Brother, brother, go to thy cell and say 'God be merciful to me.'" From the lectures of Krantz to the clergy of Hamburg Bertold Moller edited *Spirantissimum opusculum in officium misse* (1506). Krantz edited also *Ordo missalis secundum ritum ecclesiæ Hamburgensis* (Strasburg, 1509), but his chief fame rests upon his historical works; he has been called a second Adam of Bremen, although others have reproached him with partizanship and plagiarism; but his writings show great diligence and the method employed in them marks essential progress in historical literature. Their titles are *Wandalia seu de Wandalorum vera origine, variis gentibus, . . . migrationibus* (Cologne, 1518); *Saxonia. De Saxon-*

icæ gentis vetusta origine, longinquis expeditionibus . . . et bellis (1520); *Hystoria von den alten Hussen zu Behemen in Kaiser Sigmunds Zeiten* (n. p., 1523); *Chronica regnorum aquilonarum Daniæ, Seciæ et Norvagiæ* (Strasburg, Germ., 1545, Lat., 1546); *Metropolis seu historia de ecclesiis sub Carolo Magno in Saxonia* (Basle, 1548). These works still possess value for the church history of north Europe and of northwestern Germany; they were continually reprinted in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, though the Roman Catholic Church put them on the index.

(Carl Bertheau.)

Bibliography: N. Wilkens, *Leben des berühmten Doct. Alberti Crantzii*, Hamburg, 1722; *Zeitschrift des Vereins für hamburgische Geschichte*, iii (1851), 395–413 (by C. Mönckeberg), x (1899), 385–484 (by E. Schäfer); O. Krabbe, *Die Universität Rostock*, i. 224–236, Rostock, 1854; R. Lange, in *Hansische Geschichtsblätter*, v (1885), 63–100; J. Moller, in *Cimbria literata*, iii. 378–392; L. Daae, in *Historisk Tidskrift*, II., iv. 187 sqq., v. 225; *ADB*, xvii. 43–44.

KRAPF, JOHANN LUDWIG: Pioneer missionary; b. at Derendigen, near Tübingen, Jan. 11, 1810; d. at Kornthal (5 m. n.w. of Stuttgart) Nov. 26, 1881. He studied at the Latin school at Tübingen, at the school of the Basel Mission, and at the University of Tübingen; after a short experience as vicar and teacher, he was sent in 1838 to join the Abyssinian mission of the Church Missionary Society, but the attempt there was rendered abortive through hostile Roman Catholic influence. In 1839 he went to Shoa, south of Abyssinia, and won the confidence and protection of the king of that region, but in 1842 Roman Catholic interference again interrupted his work. In 1844 he established himself in Mohammedan territory at Mombasa (see Africa, II., British East Africa Protectorate), where he occupied himself in missionary labors, in the study of the languages, the compilation of dictionaries, and in the work of Bible translation. In consequence of surveys of the territories carried out in frequent missionary journeys, the mission work in East Africa was systematically planned. In 1855 he returned to Kornthal, where, except for two journeys to Africa on special missions, he carried on his lexicographical work and that of translating the Bible into the languages of Eastern Africa.

Bibliography: Von W. Claus, *Johann Ludwig Krapf*, Basel, 1882.

KRAUS, FRANZ XAVER: Roman Catholic; b. at Treves Sept. 18, 1840; d. at San Remo (26 m. n.e. of Nice), Italy, Dec. 28, 1890. He studied at Treves, and at the universities of Freiburg and Bonn, and after residing for a time in Paris, was appointed to a benefice at Pfalzel, near Treves, in 1865. In 1872 he was appointed associate professor of the history of art in the University of Strasburg, whence he was called, in 1878, to Freiburg, as professor of church history. In 1904 the Kraus-Gesellschaft was founded in his honor at Munich to promote the deepening of the Christian life and to further harmony between Roman Catholics and Protestants. Among Kraus's numerous publications mention may be made of his *Beiträge zu Trierschen Archäologie und Geschichte* (Treves, 1868); *Die christliche Kunst in ihren frühesten Anfängen* (Leipsic, 1872); *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte für Studierende* (4 vols., Treves, 1872–76); *Roma sotteranea; die römischen Katakomben* (Freiburg, 1873); *Kunst und Altertum in Elsass-Lotharingen* (4 vols., Strasburg, 1876–92); *Charakterbilder aus der christlichen Kirchengeschichte* (Treves, 1879); *Synchronistische Tabellen zur christlichen Kunstgeschichte* (Freiburg, 1880); *Realenzyklopädie der christlichen Altertümer* (2 vols., 1882–86); *Die Miniaturen des Codex Egberti in der Stadtbibliothek zu Trier* (Freiburg, 1884); *Die Wandgemälde der S. Georgskirche zu Oberzell auf der Insel Reichenau* (1884); *Die Miniaturen der Manesse'schen Liederhandschrift* (Strasburg, 1887); *Die Kunstdenkmäler des Grossherzogtums Baden* (in collaboration with J. Durm and E. Wagner; 6 vols., Freiburg, 1887–1904); *Die christlichen Inschriften der Rheinländer* (2 vols., 1890–94); *Die Wandgemälde von St. Angelo in Formis* (Berlin, 1893); *Geschichte der christlichen Kunst* (2 vols., Freiburg, 1895–1908); *Essays* (2 vols., Berlin, 1896–1901); *Dante, sein Leben und sein Werk, sein Verhältnis zur Kunst und zur Politik* (1897); *Die Wandgemälde der St. Sylvesterkapelle zu Goldbach am Bodensee* (Munich, 1902); and *Cavour, die Erhebung Italiens im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Mainz, 1902).

Bibliography: K. Braig, *Zur Erinnerung an Franz Xaver Kraus*, Freiburg, 1902 (contains complete list of his writings); E. Hauviller, *Franz Xaver Kraus: Lebensbild aus der Zeit des Reformkatholizismus*, Colmar, 1904.

KRAUSS, SAMUEL: Hungarian Jewish scholar; b. at Ukk, county of Zala, Feb. 18, 1866. He studied at the rabbinical seminary at Budapest and the university of the same city (1884–89), then in Berlin, taking the degree of Ph.D. at Giessen in 1893 and receiving the rabbinical diploma from the seminary at Budapest in 1894. In 1894 he became professor of Hebrew at the rabbinical seminary at Budapest, and in 1906 professor at the similar institution in Vienna. He was the managing editor of the Hungarian translation of the Bible made by him in collaboration with W. Bacher and J. Bánóczi. In theology he is a progressive conservative. Besides a Hungarian translation of the Talmudic tractate *Derekh Ereẓ* (Budapest, 1895), he has prepared a Hebrew commentary on Isaiah (Zhitomir, 1904) and written *Rendszeres Zsidó Vallás es Erkölcstan* (a manual of systematic instruction in the Jewish religion; Budapest, 1895); *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum* (2 vols., Berlin, 1898–99); *David Kaufmann, Biographie* (1901); *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen* (1902); and *Bad und Badewesen im Talmud* (Frankfort, 1908).

KRAUTH, CHARLES PORTERFIELD: One of the most prominent theologians of the English Lutheran Church in America; b. in Martinsburg, Va., Mar. 17, 1823; d. in Philadelphia Jan. 2, 1883. At the age of ten he came to Gettysburg, where his father, the Rev. Charles Philip Krauth, was president of Pennsylvania College and afterward professor in the theological seminary of the General Synod. He was graduated from Pennsylvania College in 1839 and in 1841, having finished his theological course in the seminary, he took charge of a mission station at Canton, a suburb of Baltimore. From 1842 to 1855 he served congregations in Baltimore, Martinsburg, and Winchester, Va. On account of the sickness of his wife he spent the winter of 1852–1853 in the West Indies, and temporarily supplied the pulpit of the Dutch Reformed Church in St. Thomas. In 1855 he took charge of the First English Lutheran Church in Pittsburg, and in 1859 of St. Mark's Church, Philadelphia. After a short pastorate at St. Mark's he became editor of *The Lutheran*, which he made a powerful weapon against the so-called "American Lutheranism" then in vogue in the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in America. When the ministerium of Pennsylvania, in its conflict with the General Synod, resolved to establish its own theological seminary at Philadelphia, Dr. Krauth, as a matter of course, was called to the chair of systematic theology. At the formal opening of the new seminary and the installation of its first faculty (Oct. 4, 1864), he, the youngest of the faculty, delivered the inaugural address defining its theological and churchly position. A new field of activity was opened, when the first steps were taken toward the organization of the General Council (see LUTHERANS). While up to this time Dr. Krauth's literary work had been preeminently of a polemical character, the task was now to lay a strong foundation on which a general Lutheran body could be organized in the unity of the faith of the fathers. He composed the *Fundamental Articles of Faith and Church Polity*, adopted at the Reading Convention in 1866, as the basis for the constitution of the "General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America." He was also the author of the *Constitution for Congregations*, finally adopted by the General Council in 1880. When the question on the principles of church fellowship became burning in the General Council, he wrote a series of fourteen scholarly articles on this subject in *The Lutheran* (1875–76), which were afterward summed up in 106 theses on *Pulpit and Altar Fellowship*, written by order of the General Council (1877). These articles and theses may be said to represent the height of his fully matured convictions on this perplexing and delicate subject. He takes the strictly confessional position that pulpit and altar fellowship means church fellowship and that all syncretism and unionism in the pulpit and at the altar are to be rejected on principle. For ten years Dr. Krauth was president of the Council, until his failing health forbade his attendance on the conventions of that body.

Dr. Krauth's eminent gifts and comprehensive scholarship were readily appreciated beyond the limits of his own church. Soon after he became professor in the theological seminary he was elected a trustee of the University of Pennsylvania, and in 1868 he was appointed professor of mental and moral philosophy in that institution. In 1873 he was made vice-provost, and during a long vacancy performed all the duties of the provost. In 1881, in addition to his other duties, he undertook the department of history at the University of Pennsylvania. He was a member of the American Committe for the Revision of the English Version of the Bible, and was assigned to the Old-Testament company. His literary activity covers the field of philosophy as well as that of theology. Among his more important publications may be mentioned: An English translation of Tholuck's commentary on the Gospel of St. John (Philadelphia, 1859); a new edition of W. Fleming's *Vocabulary of Philosophy* (1860; in enlarged form 1875); an English translation of the Augsburg Confession, with introduction and annotations (1868); *The Conservative Reformation and its Theology* (1872), his principal work, in which he collected the most valuable of his essays and treatises; and a new edition of Berkeley's *Principles of Human Knowledge*, with introduction and annotations (1874). At the request of the ministerium of Pennsylvania he had undertaken an extended English biography of Martin Luther for the Luther jubilee of 1883, but did not live to complete this work. A. SPAETH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Spaeth, *Charles Porterfield Krauth*, vol. i., New York, 1898; B. M. Schmucker, in *Lutheran Church Review*, July, 1883; *American Church History Series*, iv. 416 sqq., et passim, New York, 1893.

KRAWUTZCKY, krū-wuts'kî, ADAM: German Roman Catholic; b. at Neustadt (59 m. s.e. of Breslau), Upper Silesia, Mar. 2, 1842; d. in Breslau in Jan., 1907. He studied in Breslau (1860–62), Tübingen (1863–64), and Munich (1864; D.D., 1865), and at the seminary for priests at Breslau (1864–65). He was ordained to the priesthood in 1865, and after being curate at Kanth and Breslau, became subdirector of the seminary and privat-docent in the University of Breslau in 1868. In 1885 he was appointed associate professor of moral theology at Breslau, and professor in 1888. He wrote *Zählung und Ordnung der heiligen Sakramente in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Breslau, 1865); *De visione beatifica in Benedicti XII. constitutionem "Benedictus Deus"* (1868); *Petrinische Studien* (2 parts, 1872–73); *Des Bellarmin kleiner Katechismus mit Kommentar* (1873); and *Einleitung in das Studium der katholischen Moraltheologie* (1890).

KRELL (CRELL), NIKOLAUS: Saxon statesman and religious reformer; b. in Leipsic c. 1550; beheaded at Dresden Oct. 9, 1601. He was the son of the jurist Wolfgang Krell, and studied at the Royal School at Grimma and at the University of Leipsic (B.A., 1572; M.A., 1575), concluding his education with a journey to Switzerland and France. It was here, no doubt, that he obtained the degree of doctor of law. He soon achieved great renown at Leipsic as a university instructor, as well as a practical jurist. In 1580 he was appointed aulic councilor by Elector Augustus, and in 1581 he was delegated as counselor and preceptor to Prince Christian. When the latter assumed the government in 1586 he pursued a policy which materially diverged from that of his father. Whereas heretofore public officers and the clergy were required to subscribe the Formula of Concord, this practise now fell away. The higher clergy who had continued loyal to the Formula of Concord were supplanted by men with Philippist views; and when Court Preacher Mirus objected, he was put under custody at Königstein. This attack on Lutheran orthodoxy in the interest of Crypto-Calvinism was attributed to Doctor Krell, who had been appointed privy councilor in 1586, and chancellor in 1589. In fact Krell wrote to John Casimir, " I'll get even with the parsons in short order; they must dance as I pipe." Moreover, a new catechism was prepared by the Dresden court preachers Steinbach and Salmuth; by the latter, too, an edition of the Bible was set afoot, with Calvinistic elucidations. A great uprising occurred when the form of exorcism was stricken out of the order of baptism. A butcher in Dresden, cleaver in hand, compelled the baptism of his child in the earlier manner; at Wittenberg the new superintendent's house was stormed and scenes of turbulence ensued on every side. Krell, nevertheless, believed himself sure of complete triumph. The territorial estates, nobles and public officers feared some prejudice to their vested rights. The elector had retrenched the official power of the former court positions and given Chancellor Krell almost unlimited power. Besides, there was dissatisfaction with the foreign policy. Henry of Navarre was supported with troops and funds in violation of a promise given by the elector in 1588; and the discontent was enhanced when the campaign of 1591 totally miscarried. But the sudden death of Christian Oct. 5, 1591, put an end to Krell's activity. Even before the burial of his patron, he was thrown into prison at Königstein, where he languished for ten years. Under the regency of Frederick William of Saxe-Weimar, a zealous Lutheran, all public officers and clergymen were again pledged to the articles of faith as expressed in the Formula of Concord. Although the estates interceded for Krell in a measure, the judicial suit against him was protracted year after year. There were manifold articles of complaint lodged against him. The Meissen Commissioner's Diet of Feb. 1, 1600, advanced four charges: seduction of the elector to Calvinism, instigation to the French campaign, alienation of the emperor, and civil division. The court of appeal at Prague condemned him to execution by the sword. The sword with which the sentence was executed is still preserved. It bears the inscription *Cave, Calviniane.*

GEORG MUELLER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: An extensive list of literature is given in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xi. 85. Consult: M. Ritter, *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation*, i. 644–645, ii. 44–61, Stuttgart, 1889–95; idem, in *ADB*, xvii. 116–122; A. V. Richard, *Der kurfürstliche sächsische Kanzler . . . Nicolaus Krell*, Dresden, 1859; F. Brandes, *Der Kanzler Krell*, Leipsic, 1873; F. von Bezold, *Briefe des Pfalzgrafen Johann Casimir*, ii. 419, Munich, 1884; G. Droysen, *Das Zeitalter des dreissigjährigen Krieges*, pp. 364–375, Berlin, 1888; J. Janssen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, vols. v.–viii. passim, Freiburg, 1893–94, Eng. transl., St. Louis, 1896–1905; G. Kawerau, *Reformation und Gegenreformation*, pp. 267, 274–276, Berlin, 1899; B. Bohnenstädt, *Das Prozessverfahren gegen den kursächsischen Kanzler N. Krell*, Halle, 1901; Moeller, *Christian Church*, iii. 297–298; *Cambridge Modern History*, iii. 711, 713, New York, 1905.

KRIEG, krîg, **KORNEL:** German Roman Catholic; b. at Weisenbach (20 m. s. of Carlsruhe), Sept. 14, 1839. He studied in Freiburg and Bonn (Ph.D., Heidelberg, 1876; D.D., Freiburg, 1879), and in 1880 became privat-docent in the former institution, where he was promoted to his present position of full professor of Biblical encyclopedia, pastoral theology, and Biblical introduction in 1883. He has written: *Grundriss der römischen Altertümer* (Altbreisach, 1872); *Monotheismus der Offenbarung und das Heidentum* (Mainz, 1880); *Die theologischen Schriften des Boethius* (Cologne, 1884); *Die liturgischen Bestrebungen im karolingischen Zeitalter* (Freiburg, 1889); *Lehrbuch der Pädagogik* (Paderborn, 1893); *Das Buch von den heiligen vierzehn Nothelfern* (Freiburg, 1895); *Fürstabt Martin Gerbert von Sankt Blasien* (1896); *F. G. Wanker, ein Theologe der Uebergangszeit* (1896); *Encyclopädie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (1900); *Wissenschaft der Seelenleitung, eine Pastoraltheologie, i.* (1905); and *Wissenschaft des kirchlichen Katechumenates* (1907).

KROPATSCHECK, krō-pāt′schek, **FRIEDRICH:** German Protestant; b. at Wismar (18 m. n. of Schwerin), Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Jan. 25, 1875. He studied in Basel, Berlin, and Greifswald (Ph.D., 1898), and from 1899 to 1901 was inspector of the theological Studienhaus at Greifswald. During this period he was privat-docent at the university of the same city, where he became associate professor of systematic theology and New-Testament exegesis in 1902; since 1904 he has held a similar position in Breslau. He has edited the *Biblische Zeit- und Streitfragen* since 1904, and has written *Johannes Dölsch aus Feldkirch* (Greifswald, 1898); *Occam und Luther* (Gütersloh, 1900); and *Die Schriftprinzip der lutherischen Kirche, i.* (Leipsic, 1904).

KROTEL, krō′tel, **GOTTLOB FREDERICK:** Lutheran; b. at Ilsfeld (25 m. e. of Carlsruhe), Germany, Feb. 4, 1826; d. in New York City May 17, 1907. He emigrated to the United States in childhood and was educated at the University of Pennsylvania (B.A., 1846). He then studied theology and was licensed to preach in 1848 by the Evangelical Lutheran ministerium of Pennsylvania, holding pastorates at Passyunk, Philadelphia, Pa. (1848–49), Lebanon, Pa. (1849–53), Lancaster, Pa. (1853–61), Philadelphia (1861–68), Holy Trinity, New York City (1868–95), and the Church of the Advent in the same city (1896–1907). He was also professor in the Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, in 1864–68, and president of the General Council, of which he was one of the founders, in 1869–70 and 1888–93. He was editor of *Der lutherische Herold* from 1872 to 1875 and one of the editors of *The Lutheran*, the official organ of the General Council, from 1881 to 1883 and editor-in-chief from 1895 till his death. In addition to translating C. F. Ledderhose's *Life of Melanchthon* (Philadelphia, 1854) and J. G. W. Uhlhorn's *Luther and the Swiss* (1876), he wrote *Who are the Blessed? Meditations on the Beatitudes* (Philadelphia, 1855) and *Explanation of Luther's Small Catechism* (1863; in collaboration with W. J. Mann).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *In Memoriam Rev. G. F. Krotel*, privately printed, New York, 1908.

KRUEDENER, krəi′de-ner″, **BARBARA JULIANA VON:** Russian mystic; b. at Riga Nov. 11, 1764; d. at Karasubazar (70 m. n.e. of Sebastopol) Dec. 25, 1824. She was the daughter of

Otto Hermann von Vietinghoff, a Russian imperial privy councilor and a man of rationalistic views and a leading freemason, and of his wife Anna Ulrica, a strict Lutheran. After a fashionable education, she was married to Baron von Krüdener Sept. 23, 1782, who was then first Russian minister at the court of Courland. The marriage proved unhappy, since the husband was conscientious and retiring, while the wife was restless, given to coquetry and to the enjoyment of fashionable society in various capitals. At Paris she formed a liaison with a young officer which she refused to terminate at her husband's demand, and would not return to her home even during her husband's last illness, his death occurring June 14, 1802. Meanwhile she published a graceful novel, *Valérie, ou lettres de Gustave de Linar à Ernest de G.* (issued anonymously, 2 vols., Paris, 1804; a reissue, ib. 1878).

During a sojourn at Riga in the summer of 1804, Juliana experienced conversion, an experience which nothing in her past life seemed to make probable. From this time forth, as her utterances attested, an unwholesome, nervous " religiosity " came to be the dominant element in her character, and, through its extravagance, reflects a cloudy mysticism like that of the enthusiasms of the Chiliasts of Baden, Alsace, and Württemberg, with whom she cultivated relations of intimacy. Borne along by the charm of a seductive, and yet, amid all its aberrations, always distinguished personality, Baroness Krüdener contrived to bring singular effects to pass. But even the sympathetic side of her nature, which impelled her to numberless benefactions to the poor and sick, came gradually to lose its purity in the atmosphere surrounding her. What especially contributed to lead her astray and to impair her esteem was her association with the Württemberg " prophetess " Marie Gottliebin Kummer (familiarly styled Die Kummerin). From the close of 1808, the baroness and her new companions traveled about in the Württemberg districts, holding conventicles; but in the summer of 1809, she was expelled, while Kummer was put in ward.

Meanwhile, the apocalyptic elation of the enthusiasts had become powerfully enhanced by the political and military events of that era. In Napoleon they beheld Apollyon (Abaddon, Rev. ix. 11); Alexander of Russia seemed to them the deliverer. And as the baroness learned that Pietistic influences were felt by the czar, her plan was laid. At Heilbronn, accordingly, in June 1815, she so thoroughly succeeded, in an audience lasting several hours, in beguiling this mobile potentate with her personal views that he became a constant " guest " at her Bible classes in Heidelberg and Paris. She fostered in him the thoughts the material sequel of which was the treaty later known as the Holy Alliance, concluded between the czar of Russia, the emperor of Austria, and the king of Prussia, Sept. 26, 1815. Before long, however, Alexander turned away from his new friend, whose persisting association with Kummer and other unsalutary elements rendered him distrustful; to this was added his displeasure on account of her indiscreet utterances regarding the Holy Alliance.

That episode marks the climax in the life of Baroness Krüdener. In the years 1816–18, attended usually by an ample retinue, she traversed northerly Switzerland and southern Baden, winning souls, in her manner, for the kingdom of heaven, and lavishly dispensing among the poor and suffering the money constantly supplied by her infatuated adorers. She fell under a particularly demoralizing influence in the person of the Post-Secretary Keller from Brunswick, who hailed her as Deborah, Esther, Judith, and even as that woman of the Apocalypse (xii. 1) who should bear the Messiah; or as Mary's " vicaress," who should engender the New Church. Indeed, miraculous powers were claimed by the baroness herself. She was finally expelled from Switzerland and the South German States, and (in 1818) returned to her home. That she and her companions remained unmolested there was owing to the grace of the Czar Alexander. She conducted classes for Biblical study at Mitau, Riga, and on her estate Kosse, near Werro. But when once again she played the political prophetess, and acclaimed Alexander as future liberator of the Greeks, the Czar wrote to her in his own hand, enjoining her to silence under pain of his disfavor. By invitation of Princess Alexander Galitzin she journeyed to the Crimea in 1824, both to improve her health and to labor among the Pietists of that region, and there fell ill and died. G. Krüger.

Bibliography: The earlier literature (cf. for it Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xi. 146–147) is entirely superseded by E. Muhlenbeck, *Étude sur les origines de la Sainte-Alliance. Avec un portrait du Mme. de Krudener*, Paris, 1888.

KRUEGER, krei′ger, **HERMANN GUSTAV EDUARD:** German Protestant; b. at Bremen June 29, 1862. He studied in Heidelberg (1881–83), Jena (1883–84; Ph.D., 1884), Giessen (1884–85; lic. theol., 1886), and Göttingen (1885–86). In 1886 he became privat-docent for theology in Giessen, where he was appointed associate professor of the same subject in 1889. Since 1891 he has been full professor at Giessen, and in 1902–03 was rector of the university. He is primarily a student of patristics and the history of dogma, and belongs to no denomination. Since 1888 he has been a collaborator on the *Theologischer Jahresbericht,* of which he has been joint editor since 1895, first with H. Holzmann (1895–1901) and later with W. Köhler (since 1901). He has likewise edited the *Sammlung ausgewählter Quellenschriften zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte,* to which he contributed *Justins Apologieen* (Freiburg, 1891) and *Augustin de catechizandis rudibus* (1893). He also translated J. Reville's *La Religion à Rome sous les Sévères* (Leipsic, 1888) and edited the second and third volumes of K. von Hase's *Kirchengeschichte auf der Grundlage akademischer Vorlesungen* (1890–92) He has written: *Monophysitische Streitigkeiten im Zusammenhange mit der Reichspolitik* (Jena, 1884); *Lucifer von Calaris und das Schisma der Luciferianer* (Leipsic, 1886); *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Freiburg, 1895; Eng. transl. by C. R. Gillet, *History of Early Christian Literature,* New York, 1897); *Was heisst und zu welchem Ende studiert man Dogmengeschichte?* (1895); *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments* (1896); *Das Dogma vom Neuen Testament*

(Giessen, 1896); *Die neueren Bemühungen um Wiedervereinigung der christlichen Kirchen* (Freiburg, 1897); *Petrus Canisius in Geschichte und Legende* (Giessen, 1897); *Die neuen Funde auf dem Gebiet der ältesten Kirchengeschichte* (1898); *Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor* (Leipsic, 1899); *Kritik und Ueberlieferung auf dem Gebiet der Erforschung des Urchristentums* (Giessen, 1903); *Philipp der Grossmütige als Politiker* (1904); *Das Dogma von der Dreieinigkeit und Gottmenschheit* (Tübingen, 1905); *Philipp Melanchthon, eine Charakterskizze* (Halle, 1906); and *Das Papstthum* (Tübingen, 1907; Eng. transl., *The Papacy; its Idea and its Exponents*, New York, 1909).

KRUMMACHER, krūm′mɑ̄ʜ″er: The name of four distinguished Reformed preachers of Germany.

1. **Friedrich Adolf Krummacher** was born at Tecklenburg (22 m. n.n.e. of Münster) July 13, 1767; d. at Bremen Apr. 4, 1845. He attended the Latin school of his native town and in 1786 became a student of theology at the small Reformed College of Lingen. Dissatisfied with the conditions there, he removed to Halle, where he attended, among others, the lectures of Knapp and Bahrdt. After the completion of his studies, he spent one year as schoolmaster in Bremen. In 1790 he was appointed associate rector of the gymnasium at Hamm. In 1793 he assumed the rectorship of the gymnasium in Mörs, on the left bank of the Rhine, in spite of the menace of war. In 1800 he was called to the professorship of theology and rhetoric at Duisburg. His theology, though tinged by the influences of the period, was marked by a piety and a reverence for Scriptural Christianity which made him a valuable counterpoise to the rationalism of his colleague Grimm. The pressure of Napoleonic autocracy had a paralyzing effect upon the University of Duisburg, and it declined still more after the town came under the rule of the newly established grand duchy of Berg; the French government did not even pay the salaries of the professors, and after Krummacher's brother-in-law Möller had left the institution in 1805, he was glad to exchange his position in 1807 for that of a country pastor at Kettwig in the romantic valley of the Ruhr, where he soon won the confidence of the Westphalian peasants. In 1812 Duke Alexis Frederick Christian of Anhalt-Bernburg appointed him general superintendent, councilor of the consistory, and chief preacher at Bernburg. In 1820 he declined a call to the University of Bonn as professor of theology. In 1821 the Evangelical Union was introduced in Bernburg under his guidance. From 1824 to 1843, when, owing to old age, he resigned his position, he was pastor of the Church of St. Ansgar in Bremen, where he acquired great popularity, though he could not compete with his colleague Dräseke as a preacher.

Krummacher possessed a contemplative, esthetic, and poetic nature, a genial disposition with a tender heart, a dignified earnestness, and a child-like simplicity. He was well trained in philology and theology, and his education was very comprehensive. He exerted much influence upon his contemporaries, not only as professor and preacher, but also as poet and prose writer. During the Duisburg period he published *Hymnus an die Liebe* (Wesel, 1801), followed by *Parabeln* (Duisburg, 1809; Eng. transl., *Parables*, London, 1824 and often), which acquired a permanent place in German literature, and a treatise, then very popular, *Ueber den Geist und die Form der evangelischen Geschichte in historischer und ästhetischer Hinsicht* (Leipsic, 1805). In his rural solitude at Kettwig he wrote, beside essays and criticisms in magazines, *Die Kinderwelt* (Duisburg, 1809), a favorite book of Queen Louise; *Das Festbüchlein, eine Schrift fürs Volk* (1809–18); *Apologen und Paramythien* (1809); and *Bibelkatechismus* (1810). While at Bernburg he published the patriotic poem *Der Eroberer* (1814); the Biblical drama *Johannes* (Leipsic, 1815); and the anonymous polemical treatise *Apostolisches Sendschreiben an die Christengemeinden von dem was Noth thut zur Kirchenverbesserung* (1815), called forth by the institution of the so-called liturgical commission in Berlin. Then followed: *Leiden, Sterben und Auferstehung unsers Herrn Jesu Christi*, twelve pictures after Goltzius with preface and text (Berlin, 1817); *Paragraphen zur heiligen Geschichte* (1818); *Fürst Wolfgang zu Anhalt, eine Reformationspredigt* (Dessau, 1820), *Briefwechsel zwischen Asmus und seinem Vetter* (Duisburg, 1820), a polemical treatise, directed against Voss; *Die freie evangelische Kirche, ein Friedensgruss* (1821); *Bilder und Bildchen* (Essen, 1823); *Katechismus der christlichen Lehre* (1823); and *Die christliche Volksschule im Bunde mit der Kirche* (1825). To the Bremen period belong: *Katechismus der christlichen Lehre nach dem Bekenntnis der evangelischen Kirche* (1825); *St. Ansgar* (Bremen, 1828); *Das Täubchen* (Essen, 1828); *Der Hauptmann Cornelius*, sermons on Acts x (Bremen, 1829; Eng. transl., *Cornelius the Centurion*, Edinburgh, 1839); *Die Geschichte des Reichs Gottes nach der heiligen Schrift* (Essen, 1831–45); *Leben des heiligen Johannes* (1833). Krummacher was a most faithful contributor to the *Bremer Kirchenbote* edited by Mallet. The first parts of the *Festbüchlein*, the juvenile writings, and the catechism were received with special favor and went into numerous editions. (H. Mallet†.)

2. **Gottfried Daniel Krummacher,** brother of Friedrich Adolf, was born at Tecklenburg (22 m. n.n.e. of Münster) Apr. 1, 1774; d. at Elberfeld (24 m. n.e. of Cologne) Jan. 30, 1837. Even as a boy he gave evidence of a peculiar and dreamy nature. At the University of Duisburg he came under the influence of its rector Franz Arnold Hasenkamp (q.v.), and of Professor Möller, which preserved him from being carried away by the rationalism of Grimm. After the completion of his studies he went to his brother Friedrich Adolf at Hamm where he taught and preached; then he became private tutor in Soest and in 1796 in Mörs, where his brother now was. Thence he was called as preacher to the neighboring town of Baerl, in 1801 to Wülfrath near Elberfeld, and in 1816 to Elberfeld itself. He exerted a wide influence by the whole-hearted sincerity of his character, evidenced in his preaching; but owing to his peculiar education he possessed some rugged and harsh traits. In his theology he followed the Dutch school of

Cocceius and Lampe, but at the same time, especially in the beginning of his activity in Elberfeld, taught absolute predestination with all possible harshness according to the articles of the Synod of Dort. Unlike Lampe, Krummacher attracted only the elect while he repelled the unconverted. In spite of the apparent dryness and stiffness of his sermons, he attracted his hearers by the irresistible power of his conviction, and by the depth and fervor of his Christian experience which he owed chiefly to writings like those of Madame Guyon, Bunyan, Bogatzky, and Tersteegen. From an exegetical standpoint his sermons are open to criticism for their arbitrary Biblical interpretation. Krummacher's appearance at Elberfeld, just at the time of the religious awakening, produced a revival which caused a sensation in the whole country. Carried away by his success, he did not shrink from the very extremes of the doctrine of predestination, and the offensive conduct of his adherents necessitated the interference of the ecclesiastical authorities. Krummacher tried to modify his doctrine and manners, but some of his followers adhered strictly to the principles of predestination, and after his death and that of his nephew joined the Dutch Reformed congregation of Dr. Kohlbrügge in Elberfeld.

Krummacher published a number of sermons: *Reformationspredigten* (Elberfeld, 1817), *Beitrag zur Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist evangelisch?* (1828), *Jakobs Kampf und Sieg* (1829; Eng. transl., *Jacob Wrestling with the Angel*, London, 1838), *Die evangelische Lehre von der Rechtfertigung* (1831), *Die Wanderungen Israels durch die Wüste nach Kanaan, in Beziehung auf die innere Führung der Gläubigen beleuchtet* (1834; Eng. transl., *Israel's Wanderings in the Wilderness*, 2 vols., London, 1837), *Die hohepriesterliche Segensformel* (1834), *Wahrheit zur Gottseligkeit, oder Hauspostille* (1834), *Gute Botschaft* (1838). *Tägliches Manna für Pilger durch die Wüste* was published posthumously by his friends (1843). He also published a translation of Calvin's commentary on Philippians (Düsselthal, 1836).

(M. Göbel†.)

3. Friedrich Wilhelm Krummacher, elder son of Friedrich Adolf, was born at Mörs (17 m. n.n.e. of Düsseldorf) Jan. 28, 1796; d. at Potsdam Dec. 10, 1868. He studied at the high-schools of Duisburg and Bernburg, and then studied theology in Halle and Jena. In 1819 he became assistant preacher of the Reformed congregation in Frankfort. In 1823 he was appointed preacher at Ruhrort, in 1825 at Gemarke (Barmen). In 1834 he went to Elberfeld as colleague of his uncle Gottfried Daniel. A sermon preached by him on Gal. i. 8, 9 in 1840 at the Church of St. Ansgar in Bremen (translated into English under the title *Paul not a Man to Suit the Taste of our Age*, London, 1841), occasioned the "Bremen Controversy," which extended over several years and called forth numerous treatises. In 1847 he became preacher at Trinity Church in Berlin, and in 1853 court preacher at Potsdam. His style is sometimes too picturesque and addicted to the use of foreign words; but his homiletic power is undeniable. As he successfully opposed rationalism with all the resources of wit, genius, and faith, and tried to restore the old beliefs, so, with Tholuck and Claus Harms, he was influential in throwing overboard the mechanical mode of preaching which followed Reinhardt.

The most important of F. W. Krummacher's numerous works was *Elias der Thisbiter* (Elberfeld, 1826; Eng. transl., *Elijah the Tishbite*, London, 1836; a classic). Other works were: *Salomo and Sulamith* (1828; Eng. transl., *Solomon and Shulamite*, London, 1838); *Blicke ins Reich der Gnade* (1828; Eng. transl., *A Glance into the Kingdom of Grace*, 1837); *Kirchliche Lehrstimmen* (1832; Eng. transl., *The Church's Voice of Instruction*, 1839); *Der Prophet Elisa* (1837; Eng. transl., *Elisha*, 1838); *Der scheinheilige Rationalismus* (1841); *Weg zum Heil* (1842); *Theologische Replik* (1846); *Das Adventsbuch* (Leipsic, 1847); *Die Sabbathsglocke* (12 parts, 1851–1858); *Das Passionsbuch* (1854; Eng. transl., *The Suffering Saviour*, Edinburgh, 1856); *Des Christen Wallfahrt nach der himmlischen Heimath* (Berlin, 1858); *Immanuel Friedrich Sander* (1860); *Christus lebt; ein Oster- und Pfingstbuch* (1862; Eng. transl., *The Risen Redeemer*, 1863); *David, der König von Israel* (1867; Eng. transl., 1867); and an autobiography (Berlin, 1869; Eng. transl., 1869). (R. Kögel†.)

4. Emil Wilhelm Krummacher, younger son of Friedrich Adolf, was born at Mörs (17 m. n.n.e. of Düsseldorf) May 7, 1798; d. at Bonn Jan. 15, 1886. From 1841 to 1876 he was preacher in Duisburg. Like his father and brother he published a number of devotional works, which, however, did not attain the same importance as theirs. Among them are: *Hirtenruf zur lebendigen Quelle des Heils* (Elberfeld, 1830); *Das Dogma von der Gnadenwahl* (Duisburg, 1856); and *Gideon, der Richter Israels* (Elberfeld, 1861). (H. Mallet†.)

Bibliography: 1. A. W. Möller, *F. A. Krummacher und seine Freunde*, 2 vols., Bremen, 1849; *ADB*, xvii. 240–243.

2. E. W. Krummacher, *Gottfried Daniel Krummachers Leben*, Elberfeld, 1838; A. W. Möller, ut sup.; *ADB*, xvii. 246–247;

3. Friedrich Wilhelm Krummacher, *Selbstbiographie*, Berlin, 1869; Eng. transl., *Autobiography*, Edinburgh, 1869; A. Nebe, *Zur Geschichte der Predigt*, Wiesbaden, 1879; *DNB*, xvii. 243–246.

KUEBEL, ku′bel, **ROBERT:** German Protestant; b. at Kirchheim-unter-Teck (15 m. s.e. of Stuttgart) Feb. 12, 1838; d. at Tübingen Dec. 4, 1894. He studied theology at Tübingen, 1856–60, and, on completing his studies, became instructor of Hebrew in the Seminary of Blaubeuren. In 1865 he became repetent at the theological seminary in Tübingen, in 1867 deacon in Balingen, in 1870 professor and director in the preachers' seminary at Herborn, and in 1874 city pastor, religious instructor, and school inspector at Ellwangen. In 1879 he succeeded J. T. Beck as professor of Christian dogmatics and ethics at Tübingen. His theological position was essentially that of Beck. Indeed, he was the last academic representative of that peculiarly Swabian Biblical realism which was founded by Bengel and revised by Beck.

In the center of Kuebel's theology stands the conception of the kingdom of God. This exists in heaven, and has been revealed to man through the appearance of Christ. Christ belongs essentially to the other world and brings us the state of justification. Great emphasis is laid upon the authority of Scripture, though its infallibility is restricted to that which Christ and the apostles established by the authority of their teachings. Regeneration is not accomplished without the faith of the person to be baptized. The baptism of children produces a Christian disposition, but not regeneration. The main task of the Christian is self-training for the kingdom of God; but since God is also the lord of the earth, faithful fulfilment of our earthly calling serves as preparation for eternal destiny. Christian virtue is similarity to Christ. Kuebel distinguishes sharply between the secular state and the kingdom of God. The life of the people can be Christianized neither through a Christian state nor through a church of the people (*Volkskirche*). The test of the true Church is its membership of real believers. The majority of church members are catechumens who stand in the vestibule of the true Church. He reproaches the modern Church because it strives to be a world power, in contrast to the world-renouncing spirit of Christianity in earlier times. Modern Christianity preaches the reconciliation of Christianity and culture, while the modern view of the world is irreconcilable with the Biblical view. In the Evangelizing spirit and in the craze for forming religious associations he sees an infringement upon family life. He holds that the worldly spirit of modern Christianity must sooner or later disperse the Church and produce a more compact union of true believers. The hope of a millennium in the sense of a material kingdom of Christ is to be rejected; it is the duty of the Christian in this world to remain faithful to the Lord in patience and to long for the future; for Christianity can never make heaven out of earth. His principal works are: *Bibelkunde* (2 parts, Stuttgart, 1870); *Das christliche Lehrsystem, nach der heiligen Schrift dargestellt* (1874); *Katechetik* (Barmen, 1877); *Ueber den Unterschied der positiven und der liberalen Richtung in der modernen Theologie* (Nördlingen, 1881); *Christliche Bedenken über modern-christliches Wesen von einem Sorgvollen* (1888); *Exegetisch-homiletisches Handbuch zum Evangelium des Matthäus* (2 parts, 1889); and the posthumous *Christliche Ethik* (1896). He also wrote commentaries on Galatians, Philippians, the Pastoral Epistles, and James for Grau's *Bibelwerk* (2 vols., Bielefeld, 1876–1880), and commentaries on the Pastoral Epistles, Hebrews, and Revelation for Strack and Zöckler's *Kurzgefasster Kommentar* (9 vols., Nördlingen, 1886–94). (Karl von Burk†.)

Bibliography: *Robert Kübel, nach eigenen Aufzeichnungen geschildert*, Stuttgart, 1895; Burk, in *NKZ*, vol. vi. 1895.

KUECHENER, kü'Hen-er, **HERMANN:** German mystic. He is known only through his trial for heresy at Würzburg in 1342. The trial ended with his recantation, but, as his sincerity was doubted, he was detained in prison for some time. His confessions before the court show that he was an adherent of the then widely prevalent quietistic-pantheistic mysticism (see Free Spirit, Brethren of the). By a mystical absorption into the absolute divine being he imagined that he transformed himself into God. He became impervious to all sense-impressions, fancied that he was soaring high above the earth, and that he could walk across the Rhine without wetting his feet. In this " deized " state, the person of Christ, the hierarchy, dogmas and precepts of the Church, and even moral laws, lost all significance for him. Herman Haupt.

Bibliography: *Monumenta Boica*, xl. 415–421, Munich, 1870; H. Haupt. *Die religiösen Sekten in Franken vor der Reformation*, pp. 6 sqq., Würzburg, 1882.

KUEHL, kül, **ERNST RICHARD THEODOR:** German Protestant; b. at Visbuhr (near Köslin, 100 m. w. of Danzig) Apr. 29, 1861. He studied in Berlin (1878–82; Ph.D., Halle, 1882), and, after a year in Italy (1882–83), was inspector of the Sedlnitzkysches Johannaeum in Breslau 1883–87. In 1887 he became associate professor of New-Testament exegesis in Breslau, and in 1893 went to Marburg as full professor of the same subject. Since 1895 he has been professor of New-Testament exegesis at Königsberg. He has written: *Die Massorah und die Septuaginta im Jeremia* (Halle, 1882); *Die Gemeindeordung in den Pastoralbriefen* (Berlin, 1885); *Die Briefe Petri und Judä* (in H. A. W. Meyer's *Kritisch-exegetischer Handkommentar über das Neue Testament*, Göttingen, 1887); *Die Heilsbedeutung des Todes Christi* (Berlin, 1890); *Zur paulinischen Theodicee* (1897); *Rechtfertigung auf Grund des Glaubens und Gericht nach den Werken bei Paulus* (Königsberg, 1904); *Ueber II Kor. v. 1–10, ein Beitrag zum Hellenismus bei Paulus* (1904); *Stellung des Jakobusbriefes zum alttestamentlichen Gesetz und zur paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre* (1905); *Erläuternde Umschreibung der paulinischen Briefe unter Beibehaltung der Briefform, i.* (1905); and *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu* (1908).

KUEHNOEL, küh'neil (**KUINOL, KUINOELIUS**), **CHRISTIAN GOTTLIEB:** German Protestant; b. at Leipsic Jan. 2, 1768; d. at Giessen Oct. 23, 1841. He was educated at the Thomas School in Leipsic, and at the University of Leipsic (Ph.D., 1787), where in 1788 he established himself as privat-docent for philosophy and philology. In his lectures, as well as in his publications, he occupied himself equally with Old- and New-Testament exegesis and with the exposition of Greek and Roman classics. In 1790 he became professor extraordinary of philosophy at Leipsic; in 1799 he was called to Giessen, where he remained until his death. In 1809 he became ordinary professor in the theological faculty there. His lectures suffered from philological dryness, but he exercised a sound and stimulating influence upon many of his hearers, in a scientific as well as practical direction, and his writings, in spite of their disagreeable diffuseness and pedantry were in high authority and acquired fame even beyond the borders of Germany. He wrote translations of Hosea (Leipsic, 1789), of the Messianic prophecies (1792), and of the Psalms (1799), with brief German notes; *Geschichte des jüdischen Volks von Abraham bis auf Jerusalems Zerstörung* (1791); a Latin commentary on Hosea (1792); *Observationes ad Novum Testamentum ex libris apocryphis Veteris Testamenti* (1794); *Pericopæ evangelicæ* (2 vols., 1796–97); and *Specimen observationum in Psalmos* (in *Commentationes theologicæ* (vol. iv., 1798). Of higher value are his commentaries on the New Testament, especially his *Commentarius in libros Novi Testamenti historicos* (4 vols., 1807–18), and the *Commentarius in Epistolam ad Hebræos* (1831). He wrote also a number of works on classical philology.

(O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. W. Justi and J. M. Hartmann, *Hessische Denkwürdigkeiten*, iv. 2, pp. 435 sqq., Marburg, 1805; H. E. Scriba, *Biographisch-literärisches Lexikon*, i. 199–200, ii. 419, Darmstadt, 1831–43; *ADB*, xvii. 354–357.

KUENEN, kü′nen, **ABRAHAM:** Dutch theologian and Biblical scholar; b. at Haarlem Sept. 16, 1828; d. at Leyden Dec. 10, 1891. He studied at the gymnasium in Haarlem and the University of Leyden, and at the latter institution attracted the attention of his teachers, particularly of the orientalist Juynboll and of the theologian Scholten. In 1851, by editing passages of the Samaritan Pentateuch and of the Arabic version of Abu Said, he gained his doctorate and also an assistant-curatorship in the University of Leyden; he also became assistant professor of the Semitic languages, and, in 1855, professor of theology. He lectured on introduction to the Old Testament, on the history and religion of Israel, on the branches of New-Testament studies which were especially in his charge, on propædeutics and methodology, and, from 1860, also on ethics. As a member of the theological faculty until 1877 it was his duty to preach regularly at the academic services. Tiele says that the sermons thus delivered were uttered with warmth but without emotion, and that while the convincing logic of Kuenen's exposition appealed to the intelligence of his hearers, the philosophical repose of the man did not attract the multitude. Kuenen was neither a brilliant speaker nor a popular orator, but he was an excellent teacher and a convincing lecturer, possessing the gift of clear communication of ideas. His style was simple, but warm and impressive when a question of principle was involved. He sought to convince not by showy rhetoric but by a wealth of illustration, keen criticism and convincing argumentation. The variety of subjects taught by him is sufficient proof of his versatility. In a new partition of the branches of instruction among the professors, Kuenen retained the department of the Old Testament.

Kuenen was one of the founders and editors of the *Theologische Tijdschrift*, was president of the Teyler Stichting, secretary of the Haagsche Genootschap tot Verdediging van den Christelijken Godsdienst, and president of the Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen at Amsterdam. In the struggle between orthodoxy and the liberal movement, he was a leader of the modern school. In his *De religione Christiana per continuas theologiæ commutationes sibi constanti et incolumi* he combated the orthodoxy which demanded belief in the contravention of natural law. On the other hand, he often preached moderation to the more ardent advocates of liberalism. Industrious from his youth, Kuenen was endowed with a remarkable memory, so that the volume, variety, and exactness of his learning were phenomenal. He was not a discoverer of truth, but was a scholar of great acumen, a critic of the first rank, whose importance can be explained by the combination of a pure character with a high intelligence. His personality was revealed both in his great modesty and in his stern devotion to duty, which led him to accept from opponents as well as from sympathetic fellow workers whatever he recognized as truth. In his writings he aimed to present simply the facts as he believed he had found them, while his readers were left to draw the conclusions.

Kuenen's most noteworthy production is his *Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek naar het onstaand en de verzameling van de Boeken des Ouden Verbonds* (3 vols., Leyden, 1861–65; Eng. transl. of part, *Historico-critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch*, London, 1886), an exhaustive study of the sources for the history of the people and religion of Israel preserved in the Old Testament. In this he adopts the hypothesis of Graf that the priest code is of later date than the other Pentateuchal documents, and defends and illustrates it with a wealth of learning and quiet moderation, and with great sobriety of judgment. He also contributed much of value to the knowledge of the structure of Hebrew poetry. Of less value is Kuenen's other principal work, *De Godsdienst tot den ondergang van den Joodschen staat* (2 vols., Haarlem, 1869–1870; Eng. transl., *Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State*, London, 1873–75), which, in its sympathy with the recoil from a one-sided supernaturalism, fails to take account of the divine factor in history; e.g., when merely natural evolution is discerned in prophecy. This comes out especially in *De Profeten en de profetie onder Israel* (2 vols., Leyden, 1875; Eng. transl., *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, London, 1877). Another valuable contribution is Kuenen's Hibbert Lectures on *National Religions and Universal Religions* (London, 1882), which appeared also in Dutch, German, and French. He rendered great service by his collaboration with H. Oort and I. Hooykaas in the translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew into Dutch in *De Bijbel voor Jongelieden* (8 vols., The Hague, 1871–78, new ed., 1900, Eng. transl., *Bible for Learners*, 6 vols., 1873–79), and in *Kinderbijbel* (2 vols., 1887–88; cf. E. Kautzsch in *TSK*, lxxiv., 1901, pp. 670–681). He wrote also: *Het goed recht der modernen* (Leyden, 1866); *Friedrich Schleiermacher in de akademische godsdienstoefening* (1868); and *Les Origines du texte masoréthique de l'Ancien Testament* (Paris, 1875), while his contributions to periodicals were exceedingly numerous and weighty, especially those to *Nieuw en Oud* and to the *Theologische Tijdschrift*.

A. KAMPHAUSEN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A complete list of Kuenen's works is given in *Gesammelte Abhandlungen Kuenens*, ed. K. Budde, pp. 501–511, Freiburg, 1894. For his life consult the sketches by P. H. Wicksteed, in *JQR*, v (1892), 571–605; C. H. Toy, in *New World*, i (1892), 64–88; C. P. Tiele, in the "Year Book of the Amsterdam Academy of Sciences" for 1892; H. Oort, in *ThT*, 1892, pp. 113–116, and in *De Gids*, 1892; W. C. van Manen, in *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*, 1892, passim; A. Réville, in *Mannen van beteekenis*, vol. xxi., Haarlem, 1890. A valuable list of review articles is indicated in Richardson, *Encyclopaedia*, p. 606.

KUENSTLE, künst′le, **KARL:** Roman Catholic; b. at Schutterwald (near Offenburg, 17 m. s.s.w.

of Carlsruhe) Baden, Oct. 8, 1859. He studied in Freiburg and Würzburg, was curate at Meesburg (1884–86) and Rastatt (1886–88), and studied for two years in Italy. In 1895 he became privat-docent in Freiburg, associate professor of patristics in 1896, and honorary professor of the same subject in 1903. He has written: *Ueber den Libellus precum des Faustinus und Marcellinus* (Freiburg, 1890); *Hagiographische Studien über die Passio Felicitatis cum septem filiis* (Paderborn, 1894); *Eine Bibliothek der Symbole und theologischen Traktaten zur Bekämpfung des Priscillianismus und westgothischen Arianismus aus dem sechsten Jahrhundert* (Mainz, 1900); *Die Pfarrkirche St. Peter und Paul in Reichenau-Niederzell und ihre neuentdeckten Wandgemälde* (in collaboration with K. Bayerle; Freiburg, 1901); *Das Comma Joanneum auf seine Herkunft untersucht* (1905); *Antipriscilliana, dogmengeschichtliche Forschungen und Texte* (1905); and *Die Legende der 3 Lebenden und der 3 Toten und der Totentanz* (1908).

KULTURKAMPF. See ULTRAMONTANISM.

KUNZE, kun′ze, **JOHANNES WILHELM:** German Protestant; b. at Dittmannsdorf, near Meissen, Saxony, Aug. 31, 1865. He studied in Leipsic and Erlangen, and taught at the seminary in Annaberg 1888–89 and at the Wettiner Gymnasium, Dresden, 1889–92. Then until 1903 he was assistant university preacher at Leipsic, where he became privat-docent in 1894 and associate professor of the history of dogma in 1899. In 1903 he was appointed professor of systematic theology in the Evangelical theological faculty in Vienna, and in 1905 became professor of systematic and practical theology in Greifswald. He has written *Marcus Eremita, ein neuer Zeuge für das altchristliche Taufbekenntnis* (Leipsic, 1895); *Das nicänisch-konstantinopolitanische Symbol* (1898); *Glaubensregel, heilige Schrift und Taufbekenntnis* (1899); *Christoph Ernst Luthardt, ein Lebens- und Charakterbild* (1903); *Die ewige Gottheit Jesu Christi* (1904); and *Die Uebergabe der Evangelium beim Taufunterricht* (1908). Kunze is one of the editors of *Quellenschriften zur Geschichte des Protestantismus* (1905 sqq.).

KUNZE, JOHN CHRISTOPHER: Lutheran; b. at Artern (30 m. w.s.w. of Halle), Prussian Saxony, Aug. 4, 1744; d. in New York July 24, 1807. He received his classical training in the gymnasia at Rossleben and Merseburg, and studied theology at the University of Leipsic. After teaching a few years he came to Philadelphia in 1770 as associate pastor of the Lutheran congregation there. He remained in this work till 1784, maintaining during a part of this time a theological seminary and also serving as professor of oriental languages and literature at the University of Pennsylvania 1780–84. From 1784 till his death he was pastor of the Lutheran congregation in New York, and was also professor of oriental languages and literature at Columbia 1784–87 and again 1792–99. He was an early advocate of the necessity of English education for German youth, and it was largely through his influence that English was introduced into the pulpits of German churches in America. He edited *A Hymn and Prayer Book for . . . Lutheran Churches* (New York, 1795), the first English Lutheran hymn-book published in the United States.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. E. Norton, *Four American Universities*, New York, 1895; *Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, iii. 578, ib. 1898.

KURTZ, kūrtz, **JOHANN HEINRICH:** German exegete and church historian; b. at Montjoie (16 m. s.s.e. of Aachen), Rhenish Prussia, Dec. 13, 1809; d. at Marburg Apr. 26, 1890. He attended the Latin school of Montjoie (1821–23) and the gymnasia of Dortmund (1825–27) and Soest (1827–1830), studied theology at Halle (1830–31) and Bonn (1831–33), became teacher of religion at the gymnasium of Mitau in 1835, and professor of church history at Dorpat in 1849. In 1859 he became professor of Old-Testament exegesis, and continued as such until 1870 when he was pensioned. From 1855 to 1866 he was dean of the theological faculty. In 1871 he settled at Marburg, where he spent the rest of his life in literary labors.

His first book was *Die Astronomie und die Bibel. Versuch einer Darstellung der biblischen Kosmologie, sowie einer Erläuterung und Bestätigung derselben aus den Resultaten und Ansichten der neueren Astronomie* (Mitau, 1842); in later editions the material of this work was considerably enlarged and the title was changed to *Bibel und Astronomie, nebst Zugaben verwandten Inhalts. Eine Darstellung der biblischen Kosmologie und ihrer Beziehung zu den Naturwissenschaften* (5th ed., Berlin, 1865; Eng. transl., *The Bible and Astronomy*, Philadelphia, 1857). The work is characterized by a certain theosophical type of thought and shows the great interest which Kurtz took in the results of natural science. He tried to prove the central position of the earth in the history of the universe and show how the universe is connected with, and subordinate to, the progress and completion of man's salvation. In the same year appeared *Das Mosaische Opfer, ein Beitrag zur Symbolik des Mosaischen Kultus.* The same topic was treated by Kurtz in theological periodicals and culminated in *Der alttestamentliche Opferkultus nach seiner gesetzlichen Begründung und Anwendung* (Mitau, 1862; Eng. transl., *Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament*, Edinburgh, 1863). Another work on the Old Testament was the *Lehrbuch der heiligen Geschichte, ein Wegweiser zum Verständnis des göttlichen Heilsplans* (Königsberg, 1843; 19th ed., Leipsic, 1906; Eng. transl., *Manual of Sacred History*, Philadelphia, 1855). From this *Lehrbuch* proceeded *Biblische Geschichte der heiligen Schrift nacherzählt und für das Verständnis der unteren Klassen in Gymnasien und höheren Bürgerschulen erläutert* (Berlin, 1847; 51st ed., Breslau, 1901; Eng. transl., *Bible History*, Edinburgh, 1867), the work that made the name of the author most widely known. It is used even in the missionary schools of India. From the same *Lehrbuch* proceeded also the principal work of Kurtz in the field of the Old Testament, his *Geschichte des alten Bundes* (vol. i., Berlin, 1848, 3d. ed., 1864; vol. ii., 1855, 2d ed., 1858; Eng. transl., *History of the Old Covenant*, with annotations by A. Edersheim, 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1860), which extends, however, only to the death of Moses. The work had been preceded by investigations on the Pentateuch such as *Beiträge zur Verteidigung und Begründung der Einheit des Pentateuchs* (Königsberg, 1844) and *Die Einheit der Genesis* (Berlin, 1846). Later Kurtz changed his opinion and, like Delitzsch, distinguished different sources in the Pentateuch, but considered all as belonging to the time of Moses. The historical reality of the account in the Pentateuch and its character of revelation are the fundamental presuppositions of his work. The *Lehrbuch der heiligen Geschichte* had been followed in 1844 by *Christliche Religionslehre* (15th ed., Leipsic, 1902), which, like the former work, was destined for use in secondary schools. In 1849 appeared the *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte für Studierende* (14th ed., by N. Bonwetsch and P. Tschackert, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1906; Eng. transl., *Church History,* 3 vols., London and New York, 1889–90) and in 1852 the *Leitfaden,* since the third ed. (1856) called the *Abriss der Kirchengeschichte* (16th ed., Leipsic, 1906). Kurtz's works on church history are distinguished by his peculiar gift of clearly arranging and condensing his material and making prominent the most characteristic features in popular and vigorous language.

(N. Bonwetsch.)

KUYPER, ABRAHAM: Dutch Protestant; b. at Maassluis (10 m. w. of Rotterdam) Oct. 29, 1837. He studied in Leyden, and was pastor at Beest (1863–68), Utrecht (1868–70), and Amsterdam (1870–74). In 1874 he became a figure in the political life of Holland, being a member of the States-General for Gonda from that year until 1877. In 1894 he was again returned to the same body for Sleidrecht, and in 1901 became prime minister. In 1880 he founded at Amsterdam the Free University, where he has since been professor, lecturing on various topics as occasion requires. In theology he is a strict orthodox Calvinist, and as such founded the Reformed Free Church in 1886. He has lectured extensively in the United States, and in 1898 was L. P. Stone lecturer at Princeton Theological Seminary. Besides editing the *Standaard* (a daily newspaper) since 1872 and the *Herout* (weekly) since 1878, he has written many works, including: *Eenvormigheid, de vloeck van het moderne leven* (Amsterdam, 1869); *Het modernisme, een Fata Morgana op christelijk gebied* (1871); *Tractaat van de reformatie der kerken* (1883); *Het werk van den Heiligen Geest* (3 parts, 1888–89; Eng. transl., New York, 1900); *E voto dordraceno Toelichting op den Heidelbergschen Catechismus* (4 parts, 1892–95); and *Calvinism* (Stone lectures, 1899). He also edited Johannes a Lasco's complete works (2 vols., Amsterdam, 1866); *Kerkeraads-protocollen der hollandsche gemeente te London, 1569–1571* (Utrecht, 1870); and F. du Jon's *Opuscula theologica selecta* (Amsterdam, 1882). Portions of his *Encyclopaedie der heilige Godgeleerdheid* (3 vols., Amsterdam, 1894) have been translated into English under the title, *Encyclopædia of Sacred Theology: Its Principles* (London and New York, 1898).

Bibliography: L. H. Jordan, *Comparative Religion,* pp. 434–435, New York, 1905; W. H. de S. Lohman, in *Presbyterian and Reformed Review,* ix (1898), 561 sqq.; C. A. Mason, in *Outlook,* lxx (1902), 333 sqq.

KYDONES, kɑi-dō′nîz, **DEMETRIOS:** Greek theologian; flourished between 1330 and 1400, chiefly at Thessalonica and Constantinople. He was acquainted with many famous men, including Barlaam, Gregorios, Palamas, Nicephoros, Gregoras, Joseph Bryennios, and the Emperor John Cantacuzenus. He understood Latin, and in ecclesiastical questions of the day inclined toward Rome, favoring the union and opposing the Hesychasts. In this spirit he wrote "On the Procession of the Holy Ghost" and "On the blasphemous Dogmas of Gregory Palamas," the latter one of the most important works in the Hesychastic controversy. Kydones also polemized against Mohammedanism, and made a Greek translation of the *Confutatio Alcorani Muhamedici* of Richardus Florentinus. He was likewise able to prepare Greek versions of considerable portions of such Latin theologians as Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, was the author of a treatise "On Contempt of Death," and certain other theological addresses are ascribed to him. His works, so far as edited, are collected in *MPG,* cliv.

(Philipp Meyer.)

Bibliography: Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca,* xi. 398–405; Krumbacher, *Geschichte,* pp. 101, 487–488.

KYRIE ELEISON. See Liturgics, III.

L

LABADIE, lɑ̄″bɑ̄″dî′, **JEAN DE, LABADISTS:** The founder of a Dutch quietistic sect and his adherents. De Labadie, also called Jean de la Badie, was born at Bourg (15 m. n. of Bordeaux) Feb. 13, 1610; d. at Altona Feb. 13, 1674. He studied in the Jesuit school of Bordeaux, and against the wishes of his friends connected himself with the order, although he never became a professed member. After 1626 he devoted himself to philosophy and theology, as well as to the Vulgate and the writings of St. Augustine, developing a mystical and Augustinian trend. He was ordained in 1635, but four years later was released from his vows as a Jesuit at his own request on the plea of ill health. He then began to preach with much success as a secular priest in his native town, as well as in Paris, Amiens (where he was made canon and teacher of theology in 1640), and Abbeville. [He regarded himself as divinely inspired; cf. *Déclaration de la foi,* p. 84; *Historisch verhael Lebens Labadisten Schewingh,* p. 109.] He became attracted to the doctrines of the Reformation through his studies of the Scriptures, but was protected against the anger of the monks and priests by Cardinal Richelieu, only in 1645 to be expelled from Amiens by Mazarin as a disturber of the peace [a modification of a sentence to life imprisonment, obtained through an appeal from the assembly of the clergy of France, then in session; *Traité de la Sol de Chretiénne.*] He went later to the Carmelite hermitage at Graville in enforced retirement, where he read the "Institutes" of Calvin, with which he came into thorough agreement in doctrine, though still in sympathy with the practise of the Roman Catholic Church. [The change in his attitude he expressed in the words, "This is the last time Rome shall persecute me in her Communion. Up to the present I have endeavored to help and to heal her, remaining within her jurisdiction; but now it is full time for me to renounce her and to testify against her." Cf. G. D. J. Schotel, *Anna Maria van Schurman*, p. 160, Leyden, 1853.] The ceaseless opposition of the Jesuits, who had now become his bitter foes, and his knowledge of the life of the Reformed congregations first led him formally to declare his allegiance to the Reformed Church at Montauban in 1650. He now sought to be a reformer of the Reformed, finding his opportunity first as a preacher and later as professor of theology at Montauban. In 1657 he was expelled from Montauban and took refuge in Orange, but was forced to leave when that city was taken by Louis XIV. in 1659. He then started for London to become pastor of the Reformed French congregation there, but was so strongly urged, on the way, to remain at Geneva as preacher that he accepted, and worked there successfully for a revival in religion and morals alike. He gathered about himself a circle of disciples, including Pierre Yvon (1646–1707), Pierre Dulignon (d. 1679), François Menuret (d. 1670), Theodor Untereyk (d. 1693), and Friedrich Spanheim (d. 1701). His reputation and his writings on asceticism, meditation, and contemplation were spread throughout Holland, chiefly by the agency of Gottschalk van Schurman, and attracted the attention of earnest Christians at Utrecht like G. Voetius, J. van Lodenstein, and Anna Maria van Schurman (q.v.), who came to look upon Labadie as a possible reformer of the Dutch Reformed Church, which had degenerated into crass worldliness. After a short stay at Utrecht, where some of the prominent theologians denounced him as an irresponsible visionary, he was invited to Middleburg in 1666 as preacher to the Walloon Reformed congregation. His pastorate at Middelburg was at first successful, and while there he published his *Écrit sur la prophétie* (Amsterdam, 1668) and his *Manuel de piété* (1669).

Gradually, however, Labadie's caprice and self-will restricted his ministrations to a small circle of ardent followers, which developed into a separatistic sect. He refused to subscribe to the Belgic Confession, considering it unbiblical in many articles, and he declined to follow the Reformed liturgy, preferring extempore prayers. The breach widened, and in 1668 Labadie publicly refused to submit to the judgment of the synod and was suspended. Nevertheless he celebrated the communion before the regular service, and was accordingly deposed and forbidden to remain in Middelburg. Retiring with his followers to the neighboring town of Veer, he sought to gather there and at Amsterdam a congregation of the truly regenerate. Few of importance joined them, however, excepting Anna Maria van Schurman and Conrad van Benningen. Despite this, their services were attended by such numbers that their meetings were prohibited by the authorities in 1670, whereupon the community of some fifty persons, with five pastors and preachers, were invited by the Palgravine Elizabeth (see ELIZABETH, ALBERTINE) to settle at Herford. Their presence raised serious opposition there, and in 1672 they retired to Altona.

Shortly after the death of Labadie, his followers, now numbering 162, returned to Holland, alarmed at the war which had broken out between Denmark and Sweden, and settled in the neighborhood of the castle of Waltha or Thetinga near Wiewert in western Frisia.

Many hundreds of Labadie's converts remained in the Reformed Church as an Evangelical element. Here their communism was further developed. In the Labadist communities all dressed in the most simple fashion without adornment, and ate together at three tables, for the leaders, the brethren, and the guests respectively. Each family had a separate dwelling, but was obliged to leave the doors open in token of the community of goods. The colony supported itself chiefly by weaving, soap-boiling, and the working of iron. The government was aristocratic and hierarchic, while the distinctive doctrines were the immediate efficacy of the Holy Ghost in the hearts of the elect, the Church restricted to the regenerate, and chiliasm. The sacraments were allowed only to the regenerate, so that infant baptism was barely tolerated and communion was rare. The marriage of the regenerate was regarded as holy, the children being considered as belonging not to the parents but to the Lord, so that they were brought up in the community. On the other hand, the marriage of unbelievers was rejected as sinful. The first and most necessary virtue was obedience. Worship was extremely simple, and was led partly in French and partly in Dutch by the "speakers." The observance of Sunday was lax. During the acme of their prosperity in 1680 the Labadists were invited by Cornelis van Sommelsdyk, governor of Surinam, to send colonists to his dominions. They gladly responded, but in 1688 their plantation, which they had named Providence, had to be abandoned when the governor was murdered by his soldiers. A second attempt at colonization was made at Bohemia Manor, Cecil Co., Md., in 1684, after Jasper Dankers and Peter Sluyter, agents of the Labadists, had visited America in 1679. The Maryland colony survived until a few years after Sluyter's death (1722), but was gradually absorbed in the surrounding population. [This was the first communistic settlement in the New World (see COMMUNISM, II., § 1). The principal industries were sheep raising and tobacco culture. The peaceful existence of the community was due to the religious toleration practised in Maryland.] In 1692 the communistic system of the parent house was abandoned and each member lost a fourth of his investment. From this blow the Labadists never recovered. By 1703 the community at Wiewert had dwindled from between three and four hundred to thirty, and in 1732 the last "speaker" died and the society was finally dissolved. (G. FRANK†.)

Bibliography: The earlier literature is given in J. G. Walch, *Bibliotheca theologica selecta*, ii. 48–56, Jena, 1757–1765. Among the sources (collected in the Library of the Peabody Institute, Baltimore, Md.) are: *Déclaration de J. de L'Abadie, . . . contenant les raisons qui l'ont obligé à quitter la communion de l'église romaine*, Montauban, 1650; also his *Déclaration . . . à quitter la communion de l'église réformée*, Geneva, 1666; *Histoire curieuse de la vie, de la conduite, et des vrais sentimens du Sr. Jean de Labadie*, The Hague, 1670 (this volume contains also the *Modeste Réfutation copiée de deux lettres qui si douient joindre à l'histoire*, etc.); A. M. van Schurman, *Opuscula*, Reims, 1667; idem, *Eukleria*, Latin Altona, 1673, Dutch Amsterdam, 1684. Consult further: M. Goebel, *Geschichte des christlichen Lebens*, ii. 181–273, Coblentz, 1852 (exists also in French); H. van Berkum, *De Labadie en de Labadistene*, Sneek, 1851; F. Sjoerds, *Beknopt Levensbericht van . . . J. de Labadie*, Gorinchem, 1860; H. Heppe, *Geschichte des Pietismus der reformierten Kirche*, pp. 241–374, Leyden, 1879; A. Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, i. 194–268, Bonn, 1880; J. H. Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 166, 7–8, Leipsic, 1890; M. Bajorath, in *TSK*, 1893, pp. 125–166; B. B. James, *The Labadist Colony in Maryland*, Baltimore, 1899; Von Schubert, in *Schriften des Vereins für schleswig-holsteinische Kirchengeschichte*, iii. part 2, Kiel, 1904; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, vii. 630–632; *Journal of Jasper Dankers and Peter Sluyter*, ed. Long, in *Memoirs of Long Island Historical Society*, vol. i., 1867.

LABARUM. See Jesus Christ, Monogram of; Constantine the Great and his Sons, I., § 4.

LABBE, lā″bê′, **PHILIPPE:** French Jesuit, one of the most famous and prolific authors of his order in the seventeenth century; b. at Bourges July 10, 1607; d. at Paris Mar. 25, 1667. For a few years he taught philosophy and theology in his native city and elsewhere, but he was soon called by his superiors to Paris, where he devoted the remainder of his life to investigation and authorship. Of his writings, which number almost eighty, the most important was his *Sacrosancta concilia ad regiam editionem exacta* (18 vols., Paris, 1662–72; reprinted by N. Coletus, 23 vols., Venice, 1728–32), the last ten volumes being edited after Labbe's death by the Jesuit Gabriel Cossart (d. 1674). Introductory to this collection Labbe had already written *Galliæ synodorum conciliorumque brevis et accurata historia* (Paris, 1646) and *Historica synopsis conciliorum nationalium, provincialium, diœcesaneorum, cum vitis epistolisque Romanorum pontificum* (1661). Other works were devoted to chronology: *Concordia chronologica* (4 vols., Paris, 1656) and *Abrégé chronologique de l'histoire sacrée et profane de tous les ages et de tous les siècles* (4 vols., 1663–66); martyrology: *Hagiologium Franco-Galliæ excerptum ex antiquo martyrologio sanctæ abbatiæ Sancti Laurentii Bituricensis* (1643); Byzantine history: *Michælis Glycæ annales* (the first edition of this historian, 1660); French history: *Mélanges curieux de plusieurs sujets rares pour servir à l'histoire de la France ecclésiastique et politique* (1650); the history of literature: *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum* (1664); and the Jansenist controversy: *Triumphus catholicæ veritatis adversus novatores, sive Jansenius damnatus* (1651) and *Bibliotheca antijansenicana* (1654).

(O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: L. G. Michaud, *Biographie universelle*, xxii. 256–258, 45 vols., Paris, 1843–65; A. and A. de Backer, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la société de Jésus*, ii. 549–562, 3 vols., Liége, 1869–76; H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius*, ii. 201–210, Innsbruck, 1881; *KL*, vii. 1281–1282. On the *Concilia* consult: Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, i. 76 sqq., Eng. transl., i. 69 sqq.; H. Quentin, *Jean Dominique Mansi, et les grandes collections conciliaires*, Paris, 1900.

LABOURE, lā″būr′, **GUILLAUME MARIE JOSEPH:** Cardinal; b. at Achiet-le-Petit (11 m. s. of Arras) Oct. 27, 1841; d. at Rennes 1906. He studied at the Seminary of St. Sulpice, Paris, and became professor and superior at the Petit Séminaire of Arras. He was then vicar-general of Arras, in 1885 was consecrated bishop of Mans, and in 1893 was enthroned archbishop of Rennes. In 1897 he was created cardinal priest of Santa Maria e San Francesco al Foro Romano.

Bibliography: *Der Papst, die Regierung und die Verwaltung der heiligen Kirche in Rom*, Munich, 1904.

LACHMANN, lāʜ′mān, **CARL CONRAD FRIEDRICH WILHELM:** German philologist; b. at Brunswick Mar. 4, 1793; d. in Berlin Mar. 13, 1851. He studied classical and Germanic philology in Leipsic and Göttingen, became privatdocent at Göttingen 1815, at Berlin 1816, professor of philology at Königsberg 1818, and at Berlin 1825. He was one of the founders of modern textual criticism, made the restoration of texts the special object of his studies, and edited many Latin and old German works. His editions of Propertius (Leipsic, 1816), Catullus (Berlin, 1829), Tibullus (1829), and Lucretius (1850) are famous. His excellent editions of the New-Testament text (1831; large ed., with the Vulgate, 2 vols., 1842–50) attempt to restore that current in the Eastern Church in the fourth century. Through his *Betrachtungen über Homer's Ilias* (1847), in which he sought to show that the Iliad is made up of a number of independent lays he exerted a considerable influence on modern Homeric criticism.

Bibliography: M. Hertz, *Karl Lachmann*, Berlin, 1851; P. Schaff, *Companion to the Greek Testament*, pp. 254–256, New York, 1883; Scrivener, *Introduction*, ii. 231–235 et passim (a review of his work on the N. T.).

LACHMANN, lāʜ′mān **(LACHAMANN), JOHANN:** German Reformer; b. at Heilbronn c. 1491; d. there 1538. He was a son of Bernhard Lachamann, a celebrated bell-founder, entered the University of Heidelberg in 1505, became *baccalaureus* 1507, *magister* and assistant in master's examinations 1508, and *baccalaureus juris* 1509 (Dr. jur., 1521). In 1514 he became vicar of the parish of his native town, which belonged to the cathedral chapter at Würzburg, and at the close of 1520 he succeeded his friend Johannes Kröner of Scherding as city preacher. Luther's ideas early found a fertile soil at Heilbronn. Even Kröner is reported to have preached that more importance rested in diligently hearing the word of God than in the mass. Through Lachmann's influence the old Church continued to lose ground. In 1524 the concubinage of priests was forbidden, and the mariolatry of the Carmelites was vigorously assailed. In 1525 the barefoot friars were enjoined to preach the Gospel and then they were forbidden to preach at all. The citizens requested communion in both forms, which request the bishop refused Mar. 9, 1525. The Evangelicals' leader was

Lachmann, whom Götz von Berlichingen entreated to serve as his pastor's colleague at Neckarzimmern on occasion of a disputation with an overbearing barefoot friar.

In the Peasants' War Lachmann proved his Evangelical moderation, his courage, and his patriotism. In a written appeal (Apr. 5, 1525), he fearlessly admonished the insurgent peasants to obey the sovereign authority and return home. When the peasants entered the town (Apr. 18) the council turned to Lachmann, who induced the peasant leaders to moderate their demands, and also to renounce Heilbronn's cooperation, thus preserving his native place from grievous injuries. While the reaction fancied that it held the stakes of a game already won, Lachmann carried the council step by step, demanding the appointment of an Evangelical preacher, more frequent preaching, inauguration of the Evangelical communion, suppression of the numerous holidays, strict moral discipline, and Evangelical care of the poor. In 1526 he even dared to enter into wedlock with the daughter of the burgomaster, dreading neither the bishop's jurisdiction nor the revilements of the old school of believers. He earnestly grappled with irregularities in public worship and in moral matters, and prompted the young schoolmaster Kaspar Greter (q.v.) to undertake the religious instruction of youth. Communion was observed according to the Evangelical rite for the first time on Apr. 28, 1528; and in 1529 the German rite of baptism was also introduced.

At the Diet of Speyer in 1529, Heilbronn joined the Protestants, and also adopted the Schwabach Articles, with the exception of the seventeenth, but, at Lachmann's advice, in common with Hall, Nuremberg, and Brandenburg—Ansbach declined to enter the Schmalkald League. For the diet at Augsburg, Lachmann prepared a memorial intended to give the emperor a clear view of the Reformation and of the state of the Church in Heilbronn (Cf. *ZKG*, xxv., 1904, pp. 318–328, 460–474). The emperor was to see that the pastor remained unprejudiced in his pastoral rights, notwithstanding that Lachmann, together with the deacons, followed the regular Lutheran form of public worship, communion, and baptism, with daily preaching on week-days. Congregational singing in German alternated with the Latin singing by the school choir. After both councils and the entire citizenship had pledged themselves to fidelity toward their native town, the diet's decision was rejected, Dec. 8, 1531, and the Reformation was approved by the whole congregation. Thereupon all priests, cloisters, and the commander of the Teutonic Order were summoned to accept the Reformation. The priests complied; the cloister churches and that of the Teutonic Order were closed, on refusing their support of the Reformation. A new Evangelical liturgy was introduced Aug. 22, 1532. To relieve Lachmann from overwork the council resolved to call a second preacher and tried unsuccessfully to secure Erhard Schnepf. On May 20, 1533, Menrad Molther (q.v.) of Augsburg was called; and in 1536, Lachmann's faithful colleague, Johann Bersich, was appointed pastor. Lachmann, an ardent follower of Luther and an intimate friend of Johann Brenz, had taken part, with perfect conviction, in the *Syngramma Suevicum* (1525); and, with Brenz and Schnepf, he had constantly upheld Luther's aims. There was no need of Melanchthon's warning him on June 3, 1530, against Zwingli (*CR*, ii. 30). In 1532 when Butzer was reassuring his adherents in Kraichgau and gaining new ones, Lachmann, with Brenz, assembled the friends of Luther at Heilbronn.

Lachmann early sacrificed his strength to his fidelity in office. He was a finely cultivated, humane, and spirited man, of inflexible courage, holy zeal against everything evil and vulgar, and glowing love of country. G. Bossert.

Bibliography: C. Jäger, *Mittheilungen zur schwäbischen und fränkischen Reformationsgeschichte*, Stuttgart, 1828; H. Titot, *Kirchengeschichtliche Beiträge über Stadt und Oberamt Heilbronn*, Heilbronn, 1862; T. Pressel, *Anecdota Brentiana*, iii. 164-165, Tübingen, 1868; F. Dürr, *Heilbronner Chronik*, Heilbronn, 1895; *Beschreibung des Oberamts Heilbronn*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1901–03; *Monumenta Germaniae paedagogica*, vol. xxii., Berlin, 1903; *ADB*, xvii. 469; Duncker, in *ZKG*, xxv. 308–328; *J. Lachmann als Patriot im Bauernkrieg nach seinen Briefen*, in *Württemb. Jahrbücher*, 1908, pp. 44–76. Letters from Melanchthon to Lachmann are in *CR*, ii. 82, 871.

LACORDAIRE, lā''cōr''dār', **JEAN-BAPTISTE HENRI:** French preacher and theological writer; b. at Recey-sur-Ource (135 m. s.e. of Paris), department of Côte d'Or, Mar. 12, 1802; d. at Sorèze (14 m. s.w. of Castres), department of Tarn, Nov. 21, 1861. He was educated at Dijon, where as a law-student he came under the influence of Rousseau's writings and was a pronounced deist. Beginning to practise his profession in Paris in 1822, he was stirred by Lamennais' *Essai sur l'indifférence*, and within two years was convinced that Christianity was the indispensable basis of modern social life. He entered the seminary of Saint-Sulpice in 1824, was ordained priest in 1827, declined the position of auditor of the Rota at Rome with the idea of devoting himself to preaching, and began as almoner of the Convent of the Visitation in Paris and also, a little later, at the Collège Royal Henri IV., where his impatience with the old-fashioned Gallicanism of the university body became more and more excited. With Lamennais and Montalembert, enthusiastic over the prospect of freedom offered by the revolution of 1830, he opened a school without seeking the sanction of the privileged state university. It was closed by the police and its projectors were fined; and almost at the same time their newspaper *L'Avenir* was condemned by the pope. Lacordaire went to Rome and submitted unconditionally. On his return to Paris, he took up the defense of the Church's doctrine in a course of public addresses or *conférences*, which were enthusiastically listened to by great crowds and set forth the Ultramontane view of history in its most dazzling form. He now conceived the idea of bringing back the Dominican order, banished since the Revolution, to France. With this end in view, he visited Rome again in 1838, and early in the next year published his *Mémoire pour le rétablissement en France de l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs*. With two other Frenchmen, he entered the order on

Apr. 9, and after a novitiate at Santa Maria sopra Minerva, returned to France, where he continued to command the greatest popularity as a preacher. After the revolution of 1848, he was elected to the National Assembly, but resigned his seat on being censured by his superiors for a profession of republican principles, abandoning also the publication of his newspaper *L'Ere nouvelle*. In 1850 he went to Rome to defend the cause of the archbishop of Paris, who had condemned the reactionary newspaper *L'Univers*. At the same time France was constituted a separate province of the Dominican order, with Lacordaire for provincial. After the *coup d'état* of 1851 he left Paris, and preached there but once more, in 1853, after which the government insisted on his absenting himself from the capital. He delivered a course of *conférences* at Toulouse in 1854, and then devoted himself to education, first at Oullin and then at Sorèze, where he remained until his death, with the exception of a visit to Paris for his reception into the Academy. His complete works were published in Paris, 9 vols., 1872–73; his sermons and addresses in 4 vols., 1886–88; and three different collections of letters in 1863, 1864, and 1886. [The following have appeared in English translation: four volumes of *Conferences* delivered in Nôtre Dame in Paris (London, 1851–72); *Life: Conferences Delivered at Toulouse* (1873); *St. Mary Magdalen* (1880); *Life of St. Dominic* (1883); *Thoughts and Teachings of Lacordaire*, selections (Dublin, 1892).]

(C. Pfender.)

Bibliography: Lists of Lacordaire's works and a long list of notices of his life are given in the British Museum Catalogue. Among the many accounts of his life the best are by J. T. Foisset, Paris, 1874; F. Beslay, Paris, 1862; A. Guillemin, Tours, 1862; C. F. R. de Montalembert, Paris, 1862, Eng. transl., London, 1878; Dora Greenwell, Edinburgh, 1867; B. Chocarne, Paris, 1873, Eng. transl., London, 1878; H. L. Farrer (H. L. Lear), ib., 1887; A. de Broglie, Paris, 1895; Abbe du Hamel, Abbeville, 1896.

LACTANTIUS, lac-tan'shiʊs.

I. Life.
II. Works.
  The *De Divinis Institutionibus* (§ 1).
  Lost Works (§ 2).
  Doubtful Works (§ 3).

I. Life: The most frequently reprinted of the Latin Fathers, Lucius Cæcilius Firmianus Lactantius, was probably of African birth, though he was long thought to have been an Italian. Very little is known of his life. Jerome asserts (*De vir. ill.*, lxxx.) that he was a pupil of Arnobius, called by Diocletian to Nicomedia as a teacher of rhetoric, and forced to become a writer by lack of scholars; and he is said to have been in his old age the teacher in Gaul of Crispus, the son of Constantine. His having studied under Arnobius is, however, doubtful; and it is impossible to determine the date of his birth or whether he was of Christian or pagan parentage. Since Diocletian took up his permanent residence at Nicomedia in 285, the call of Lactantius thither was probably not much later than that date; and it is evident from the *De divinis institutionibus* (I., i. 8) that he was still holding his office there at the beginning of the persecution of Diocletian (Feb. 23, 303). If he was a Christian at that time, he must have lost the opportunity to teach in that year, and then presumably he took up his literary activity. But there is no certain evidence as to the date of his conversion to Christianity or as to his fortunes in the persecution, assuming that he was then a Christian. The facts which he describes as an eye-witness lead to the conclusion that he was still in Bithynia in 305, and probably longer. His sojourn in Gaul as the teacher of Crispus (b. 307) was probably before 317. If the *De mortibus persecutorum* was written by him, and in Bithynia (see below, § 3), he was there as late as 313.

II. Works: In the above-cited passage Jerome names twelve works of Lactantius, of which seven are wholly or almost wholly lost. Of those still extant, the *De opificio Dei* is a small treatise addressed to a former pupil named Demetrianus, a wealthy man in danger of deserting his philosophical principles for a life of pleasure. The main purpose of the treatise is to determine the relation between soul and body. Lactantius shows that God has given reason to man as a protection, and justifies the arrangements of providence by a detailed description of the structure of the human body, concluding with an exposition of the nature of the soul, and referring to a treatise still to be written against the pagan philosophers, obviously the *Institutiones*. As to the date of the work, it has been customary to draw conclusions from I., i. 7 and xx. 1, which would place it after the beginning of the persecution; but the passages quoted do not justify even such an approximate decision as this.

1. The De Divinis Institutionibus.

The principal work of Lactantius is the *De divinis institutionibus*, in seven books. The first, *De falsa religione*, combats polytheism as the basis of all errors, the unity of God being proved philosophically from the concept of a Supreme Being and historically from the testimony of poets and philosophers. In the second book, *De origine erroris*, Lactantius endeavors to show that the demons are the source of error. The third, *De falsa sapientia*, shows the weakness of philosophy, pretending to unattainable knowledge and divided into numerous conflicting sects; while the fourth, *De vera sapientia et religione*, draws a contrasting picture of Christianity. The three remaining books discuss fundamental ethical conceptions (v.), the proper form of rendering worship to God (vi.), and immortality (vii.). The same difficulty exists as in the case of the *De opificio* about the determination of the date; but it is a tenable hypothesis that the outbreak of the persecution, covering a period of at least two years, lies between the composition of the first four books and that of the fifth, according to which theory the author found leisure to continue his work only when he had left the headquarters of the anti-Christian movement. From such passages as V., xi. 15 and VI., xvii. 6 it follows that these books were written not earlier than 305 or later than the toleration edict of Galerius in 311. The *Epitome*, or abbreviated form of the *Institutiones*, was known to Jerome, and generally, until 1712, only in a mutilated form from which about one-third was missing at the beginning. In the year named it was published by C. M. Pfaff in full from a manuscript discovered by Maffei at Turin. It is addressed to a *frater Pentadius*, possibly Lactantius' own brother, and offers not so much a selection as a complete recasting in briefer form of the large work, made, according to the preface, long afterward.

The *De ira Dei* treats a question suggested in the *Institutiones* (II., xvii. 5)—whether a personal affection like anger may properly be ascribed to God. According to it, Christian theology presupposes a God who is the ruler of the world, and whom we must reverence and fear. Without the fear of God, man would fall a prey to his desires, and if God looked upon this without anger he would be permitting sin. The date can not be more closely fixed than by its references to the *Institutiones;* Brandt places it in 308, but it was more probably written after the cessation of the persecution, and thus at least as late as 311 or 312.

2. Lost Works.

Of the lost works of Lactantius, outside of a few fragments, nothing is known beyond the titles given by Jerome. Completely lost are the *Symposium*, the *Grammaticus*, the two books addressed to Asclepiades, and the metrical description of Lactantius' journey from Africa to Nicomedia, in which he followed a wide-spread literary fashion of his time. A few fragments remain of the three collections of letters mentioned by Jerome, which seem to have been rather small treatises on various subjects in epistolary form than letters in the modern sense. Damasus complains (*Epist. ad Hieronymum*, in Jerome, *Epist.*, xxxv. 1) that they are long and tedious, insufficiently representative of Christian doctrine, and written too much in the tone of a pedagogue.

3. Doubtful Works.

To the works whose authenticity is doubtful belongs the treatise which has been known since 1679 from a single manuscript where it bears the title *L. Cæcilii liber ad Donatum confessorem de mortibus persecutorum.* Its purpose is to show that the persecutors of Christianity have been visited by special divine judgments. The author is apparently well informed as to the facts he narrates, though obviously inspired by bitter hatred of the persecutors and disposed to give credence to any current gossip that suited his purpose. The book was written before the outbreak of the Licinian persecution in 321, and, since the death of Diocletian (Dec. 3, 316) is mentioned in it, not earlier than 317. The authorship has been questioned almost ever since its first publication—in recent times most vigorously by Brandt; but conclusive grounds for denying the Lactantian authorship have not yet been presented. The following facts have weight in the discussion: the style shows both resemblances to and differences from that of Lactantius, and is thus inconclusive; tradition, from Jerome down, is favorable to Lactantius; the author evidently was in Nicomedia during the persecution, and states the facts fairly, though making his own selection of them; he was evidently a man of position, from the way in which he gives important people as his authorities. The hypothesis of a literary forgery presents too many difficulties, while there is nothing in the known facts of Lactantius' life which militates against the acceptance of his authorship, since the date of his leaving Nicomedia is unsettled. The poem *De ave phœnice* is a version of the old phenix legend, written by a Christian, as is shown in the conclusion, where the phenix comes to symbolize Christ in his resurrection. There are resemblances in diction between this and the prose works of Lactantius, who is known (see above, § 2) to have written verses; and since the manuscripts ascribe it definitely to him, there is no reason for doubting this attribution, in spite of the fact that Jerome does not include it in his list. Two other poems sometimes attributed to Lactantius are now known not to be his: that entitled *De resurrectione* or *De pascha* is by Venantius Fortunatus (see FORTUNATUS), and of the *De passione Domini*, first published in the Aldine edition of 1515, no manuscript has yet been found, so that it may possibly be a Renaissance forgery.

All the works of Lactantius bear the marks of his rhetorical profession. They are pleasant reading, and successfully imitate the best classical models in style, showing a wide range of historical and antiquarian knowledge and frequently citing the classical poets and philosophers. These endowments, however, which won for Lactantius from Pico della Mirandola the title of the Christian Cicero, are less valued to-day than those of such technically inferior authors as Tertullian and Augustine. As a theologian he has small importance. Becoming, as it seems, a Christian only in his mature years, he never fully penetrated the deeper religious spirit of his new faith. In Brandt's edition the index of his quotations from classical authors fills twenty-four pages, against four for those from the Scriptures; and of the latter most are given on Cyprian's authority. His main theological content is summed up in the belief in God as the Creator of the world and in the power of the new law given by Christ, the following of which frees men from sin and its penalty. He was not touched by the Christological controversy, and his eschatology is a reproduction of the old millenarian teaching. In a word, Lactantius does not belong to the really great men of the early Church; but with all his superficiality he stands out as an attractive personality, followed as a leader by a great many in his own and later ages.

(ERWIN PREUSCHEN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Literature on the subject is to be found in *ANF*, Bibliography, pp. 77–81; Krüger, *History*, pp. 307–317; Potthast, *Wegweiser*, p. 703; J. M. Baldwin, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, iii. 1, p. 325. New York, 1905. The *Opera* of Lactantius have been frequently printed, eighty-six editions being known 1461–1739. Among the best issues are those by O. F. Fritzsche, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1842–44, in *MPL*, vi.–vii., and in *CSEL*, xix., xxvii., parts 1–2, Vienna, 1890–97. Eng. transl. with introductory notice is in *ANF*, vii. 1–328. Accounts of the life, so far as known, are usually found in the prolegomena to the editions of the *Opera*. Consult: R. Pichon, *Lactance*, Paris, 1903 (an important contribution to the subject); P. Bertold, *Prolegomena zu Lactantius*, Metten, 1861; S. Brandt, *Ueber das Leben des Lactantius*, Vienna, 1890; C. E. Freppel, *Commodian, Arnobius, Lactantius*, Paris, 1893; A. Mancini, in *Studi storici*, ii (1893), 444 sqq.

On his writings and phases of his work consult: B.

Mountain, *Summary of the Writings of Lactantius*, London, 1839; C. Leuillier, *Études sur Lactance apologiste*, Caen, 1846; C. F. Jacob, *Lactance consideré comme apologiste*, Strasburg, 1848; E. Overlach, *Die Theologie des Lactantius*, Schwerin, 1858; T. Müller, *Quæstiones Lactantianæ*, Göttingen, 1875; M. E. Heinig, *Die Ethik des Lactantius*, Grimma, 1887; A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters*, i. 72 sqq., Leipsic, 1889; F. Marbach, *Die Psychologie des Lactantius*, Halle, 1889; J. Belser, in *TQ*, lxxiv (1892), 246–293, 439–464; P. G. Frotscher, *Der Apologet Lactantius in seinem Verhältnis zur griechischen Philosophie*, Leipsic, 1895; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, ii. 494–521; Schaff, *Christian Church*, ii. 955–958; Harnack, *Dogma*, i.–v. passim; *DCB*, iii. 613–617; and in general, works on the church history of the third and fourth centuries and on the history of doctrine.

LACTICINIA: Literally " milk foods," i.e. articles of food which are the product of an animal, as distinguished from its flesh, such as milk, butter, lard, cheese, and eggs. At an early period it became customary to abstain on fasting-days, especially in Lent, not only from meat, but from other foods. The Synod of Laodicea (between 343 and 381) restricted the food taken during Lent to xerophagy, or bread, herbs, salt, and water, this being confirmed by the Trullan Council of 692, which expressly forbade eggs and cheese, and punished violation by the deposition of priests and the excommunication of laymen. In the Greek Church, especially in the Russian branch, abstinence from the lacticinia begins with the end of " cheese-week," which extends from Sexagesima to Quinquagesima.

In the West the custom of abstinence from the lacticinia on fasting-days developed at an early date, although the rule was not as rigid as in the East. It was recommended from Rome, however, in the sixth or seventh century, and was confirmed by synods after the ninth century, which subsequently forbade the eating of the lacticinia. Thomas Aquinas states that this abstinence was customary in his time, and it was finally established by Alexander VII. on Mar. 18, 1666. From Lent the prohibition of lacticinia extended to other fast-days, as is shown by papal dispensations for the dioceses of Cologne and Treves (1344), and for the landgravate of Meissen (1485). Dispensations were also granted for the eating of lacticinia in Lent, particularly in the North, and the power of such dispensation is now generally placed in the hands of the bishops at their quinquennial faculties, the exact extent to which lacticinia may be eaten being determined annually by a papal indult.

(P. Hinschius†.)

LACY, JOHN. See French Prophets.

LADD, GEORGE TRUMBULL: Congregationalist; b. at Painesville, O., Jan. 19, 1842. He was graduated at Western Reserve College in 1864 and at Andover Theological Seminary in 1869. After acting as supply at Edinburg, O., 1869–71, he was pastor of Spring Street Congregational Church, Milwaukee, Wis., 1871–79, professor of mental and moral philosophy in Bowdoin College 1879–81, and from 1881 to 1906 held a corresponding chair at Yale. In 1879–81 he lectured on church polity and systematic theology at Andover Theological Seminary, and in 1895–96 had charge of the graduate seminar in ethics at Harvard, where he has lectured repeatedly. He has also lectured in Japan (1892, 1899, 1906), and in India (as Haskell lecturer of the University of Chicago, 1899–1900). He has written: *Principles of Church Polity* (New York, 1882); *The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture* (2 vols., 1884); *Elements of Physiological Psychology* (1887); *What is the Bible?* (1888); *Introduction to Philosophy* (1889); *Outlines of Physiological Psychology* (1890); *Philosophy of Mind* (1891); *Primer of Psychology* (1894); *Psychology, Descriptive and Explanatory* (1894); *Philosophy of Knowledge* (1897); *Outlines of Descriptive Psychology* (1898); *Essays on the Higher Education* (1899); *A Theory of Reality* (1899); *Philosophy of Conduct* (1902); *Philosophy of Religion* (2 vols., 1905); and *In Korea with Marquis Ito* (1908). He has also translated several works of R. H. Lotze, including *Outlines of the Philosophy of Religion* (Boston, 1885).

LAEMMER, HUGO: German Roman Catholic; b. at Allenstein (65 m. s. of Königsberg), East Prussia, Jan. 25, 1835. In his early life a Lutheran, he was educated at the universities of Königsberg, Leipsic (Ph.D., 1854), and Berlin (lic. theol., 1856). In 1857 he became privat-docent in Berlin and in 1857–58 studied in Italy. He was received into the Roman Catholic Church at Braunsberg in 1858, immediately entered the theological seminary there, and in 1859 was ordained to the priesthood, after which he continued his studies at Rome for two years, being appointed *missionarius apostolicus* in 1861. Returning to Germany, he was subdirector of the Seminary at Braunsberg for two years, and then consultor to the Congregation of the Propaganda in Rome for a year. In 1864 he was appointed professor of moral theology at Braunsberg, and later in the same year, despite the protests of the Protestant faculty, became professor of dogmatic theology in the Roman Catholic faculty of the University of Breslau. Shortly afterward, he was created consistorial counselor, prosynodal examiner, and episcopal penitentiary. He was made an honorary member of the Doktorencollegium of the theological faculty of the University of Vienna in 1865, and in 1882 was created a prothonotary prelate. He is also a privy counselor and is now professor of church history and canon law in Breslau and a canon of Breslau. In addition to editing Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo* (Berlin, 1857); the " Ecclesiastical History " of Eusebius (2 vols., Schaffhausen, 1859–62); and *Scriptorum Græciæ orthodoxæ bibliotheca selecta, i.* (Freiburg, 1864), he has written: *Clementis Alexandrini de logo doctrina* (Berlin, 1855); *Papst Nikolaus der Erste und die byzantinische Staatskirche seiner Zeit* (1857); *De theologia romano-catholica, quæ reformatorum aetate viguit, antetridentina* (1857); *Die vortridentinisch-katholische Theologie des Reformations-Zeitalters aus den Quellen dargestellt* (a translation of the preceding work, 1858); *Analecta Romana, kirchengeschichtliche Forschungen in römischen Bibliotheken und Archiven* (Schaffhausen, 1861); *Misericordias Domini* (an autobiography, Freiburg, 1861); *Monumenta Vaticana historiam ecclesiasticam sæculi sexti decimi illustrantia* (1861); *Zur Kirchenge-*

schichte des sechzehnten und siebzehnten Jahrhunderts (1863); *De Leonis Allatii codicibus qui Romæ in bibliotheca Vallicellana asservantur* (1864); *In decreta concilii Ruthenorum Zamosciensis animadversiones theologico-canonicæ* (1865); *Cælestis urbs Jerusalem* (1866); *Meletematum Romanorum mantissa* (1876); *De martyrologio Romano* (1878); *Institutionen des katholischen Kirchenrechts* (1886); and *De Cæsaris Baronii literarum commercio* (1903).

LÆTARE SUNDAY: The fourth Sunday in Lent, so called from the first word of the introit of the mass, *lætare*, " rejoice "; it is also called *Dominica de rosa*, because the day selected by the pope for the blessing of the Golden Rose (q.v.).

LAGARDE, lā''gārd', **PAUL ANTON DE:** German Orientalist; b. at Berlin Nov. 2, 1827; d. at Göttingen Dec. 22, 1891. His family name was Bötticher, for which in 1854 he substituted Lagarde, the name of a grand-aunt who had part in his early education. He studied at Berlin 1844–46, and at Halle 1846–47, again at Berlin 1847–49; became privat-docent at Halle 1851; traveled in the interest of philosophical studies to London and Paris 1852–53; passed the next year at Halle; taught school at Berlin 1854–66; under a grant from the king spent two and a half years in work upon the Septuagint; was called as professor of oriental languages to Göttingen in succession to Ewald 1869, and labored there till his death.

Judgments of Lagarde have varied greatly. His nature was undoubtedly erratic, and hardships and misunderstandings embittered his life. He has been characterized as a prophet, who raised his voice against abuses in Church and State, education and worship, society and culture. It did not disturb him in the least that his voice was often that of one crying in the wilderness. He was also a poet, and several of his compositions have found place in popular collections. His political activity may be dismissed with the mere mention, though it was by no means least characteristic. But whatever may be thought of his activity in other fields, his importance in the world of scholarship is unquestionable. His knowledge of Oriental languages was monumental; he was master of Arabic, Aramaic, Armenian, Coptic, Hebrew, Persian, Syriac, and other Eastern tongues, and thus was enabled to do work in comparative linguistics which almost no other has been fitted to carry out. This profound erudition he gave to the service of the Old and the New Testament and to patristics, using it in the careful editing of texts, which he carried through with a thoroughness producing intense satisfaction among scholars and causing great regret that his life could not have been spared to complete some of the works which he only commenced. This is especially true of his labors upon the text of the Septuagint (*Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum, pars i., Græce*, Göttingen, 1883). He left his property to the Royal Society of Göttingen. A supplementary fund has been raised to his memory, devoted to the edition of works belonging to the culture of the Middle Ages, ecclesiastical texts and scholastic writings, and Semitic literature. Through the mediation of Paul Haupt his library was bought by the University of the City of New York.

Lagarde's literary activities were immense. R. J. H. Gottheil has published an incomplete bibliography (*Proceedings of the American Oriental Society*, 1892, pp. ccxi.–ccxxix.), which includes 297 publications. Almost all of Lagarde's works were published at his own expense. Among those which he edited or wrote the following are noteworthy: *Horæ Aramaicæ* (Berlin, 1847); *Rudimenta mythologiæ Semitica supplementa lexici Aramaici* (1848); *Arica* (Halle, 1851); *Epistolæ Novi Testamenti Coptice* (1852); *Didascalia apostolorum Syriace* (Leipsic, 1854); *Zur Urgeschichte der Armenier* (1854); *Reliquiæ juris ecclesiastici antiquissimæ Syriace, Græce* (2 parts, 1856). *Analecta Syriaca, appendix Arabica* (2 parts, 1858); *Hippolyti Romani quæ feruntur omnia Græce* (1858); *Titi Bostreni contra Manichæos libri quatuor Syriace* (Berlin, 1859); *Titi Bostreni quæ ex opere contra Manichæos in Codice Hamburgensi servata sunt Græce; accedunt Iulii Romani epistulæ et Gregorii Thaumaturgi κατὰ μέρος πίστις* (1859); *Geoponicon in sermonem Syriacum versorum quæ supersunt* (Leipsic, 1860); *Clementis Romani recognitiones Syriace* (1861); *Libri Veteris Testamenti apocryphi Syriace* (1861); *Constitutiones apostolorum Græce* (1862); *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverbien* (1863); *Die vier Evangelien aus der Wiener Handschrift herausgegeben* (1864); *Clementina* (1865); *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* (1866); *Der Pentateuch Koptisch* (1867); *Materialen zur Geschichte und Kritik des Pentateuch* (1867); *Genesis Græce* (1868); *Hieronymi quæstiones Hebraicæ in libro Genesis* (1868); *Beiträge zur baktrischen Lexicographie* (1868); *Onomastica sacra* (Göttingen, 1872); *Prophetæ Chaldaice* (Leipsic, 1872); *Hagiographa Chaldaice* (1872); *Psalterium juxta Hebræos Hieronymi* (1874); *Psalmi 1–49 Arabice in usum scholarum* (1875); *Psalterii versio Memphitica* (Göttingen, 1875); *Psalterium, Job, Proverbia Arabice* (1876); *Armenische Studien* (1878); *Symmicta* (2 vols., 1877–80); *Semitica* (2 parts, 1878–79); *Deutsche Schriften* (1878; 4th complete ed., with portrait, 1903); *Præter missorum libri duo* (1879); *Orientalia* (2 parts, 1879–80); *Aus dem deutschen Gelehrtenleben* (1880); *Veteris Testamenti ab Origene recensiti fragmenta apud Syros servata quinque* (1880); *Die lateinischen Uebersetzungen des Ignatius* (1882); *Ankündigung einer neuen Ausgabe der griechischen Uebersetzung des A. T.* (1882); *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum, pars i., Græce* (1883); *Iudæ Harizii macamæ Hebraice* (1883); *Petri Hispani (Pedro de Alcala) de lingua Arabica libri duo* (1883); *Persische Studien* (1884); *Mittheilungen* (4 vols., 1884–91); *Probe einer neuen Ausgabe der lateinischen Uebersetzungen des A. T.* (1885); *Die revidierte Lutherbibel des halleschen Waisenhauses, besprochen* (1885); *Catenæ in evangelia Ægyptiacæ quæ supersunt* (1886); *Erinnerungen an Friedrich Rückert* (1886); *Neu-Griechisches aus Klein-Asien* (1886); *Juden und Indogermanen* (1887); *Purim; ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Religion* (1887); *Agathangelus und die Akten Gregors von Armenien, neu herausgegeben* (1887); *G. Bruno, Opere italiane, ristampate da P. de Lagarde* (2 vols., 1888); *Uebersicht über die im Aramäischen, Arabischen, und Hebräischen übliche Bildung der Nomina* (1889); *Ueber einige Berliner Theologen und was von ihnen zu lernen ist* (1890); *Altes und Neues über das Weihnachtsfest* (1891); *Septuaginta-Studien* (2 parts, 1891–92); *Bibliothecæ Syriacæ* (1892). A collected edition of his *Gedichte* was issued by his wife (Göttingen, 1897).

E. NESTLE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Autobiographic material is found in his *Mitteilungen*, iii. 34 sqq.; *Symmicta*, i. 227–232; in his edition of the Greek O. T., pp. 542–544. Besides the bibliography of Gottheil, ut sup., S. R. Driver noticed several of Lagarde's works in the *Contemporary Review*, March, 1889. Nestle has in hand a complete bibliography of Lagarde's writings. The one biography of note is by his wife, Anna de Lagarde, *Paul de Lagarde; Erinnerungen aus seinem Leben für die Freunde*, Göttingen, 1894. The oration at the burial, by U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, is reproduced in the latter's *Reden und Vorträge*, pp. 90–96, 117, Berlin, 1901; a memorial oration by J. Wellhausen is in *Göttinger Gelehrte Nachrichten*, 1894, pp. 49 sqq. Later sketches are: E. Wolff, *Paul de Lagarde*, Kiel, 1892; K. Albrecht, *Paul de Lagarde*, Berlin, 1901; E. Platzhoff-Lejeune, *Paul de Lagarde*, ib. 1903. Magazine articles are: A. Neubauer, in *Athenæum*, Jan. 9,

1892; G. F. Moore, in *Andover Review*, Feb. 1892; W. Muss-Arnolt, in *Christian Intelligencer*, March 2, 1892; further literature of this kind is indicated in Richardson, *Encyclopaedia*, p. 609.

LAINEZ, lai-neth′ **(LAYNEZ), IAGO (DIEGO):** Spanish Jesuit; b. at Almazan (95 m. n.e. of Madrid), Castile, 1512; d. at Rome Jan. 19, 1565. After graduating at the University of Alcala, he went to Paris in 1533, joined Ignatius Loyola there, and was one of the six young men who, with Ignatius, took the vows of the society in the church of Montmartre Aug. 15, 1534. For many years he preached in Italian cities in the interest of the new movement, was provincial for Italy 1552–54, and on the death of Ignatius, in 1556, he became the head of the society as vicar-general. In 1558 he was elected general. During the eight years of his shrewd leadership he greatly extended the work and influence of the society. As the most prominent papal theologian at the Council of Trent he exercised a direct influence on the history of the Roman Church by his defense of papal infallibility, and of papal views in general. So important a factor was he in the council that frequently, when he was prevented by illness from attending, the sitting was postponed till he could be present. In 1561 he took a leading part in the Conference of Poissy between the Roman Catholics and the Huguenots. He published no important work. H. Grisar has edited his *Disputationes Tridentinæ* (2 vols., Innsbruck, 1886).

Bibliography: As sources the early lives by M. d'Esne, Douai, 1597, P. de Ribadeneira (in French), Douai, 1597 (and in Latin), Cologne, 1604, and by F. Dilarino (pseudonym), Rome, 1672, are to be consulted. Modern lives are by J. Boero, Paris, 1894; H. Müller, *Les Origines de la compagnie de Jésus; Ignace et Lainez*, ib. 1898; cf. *KL*, vii. 1555–57.

LAITY: The body of non-clerical members of the Christian community. The designation is foreign to the very early Church (cf. Gal. iii. 26–28) [though the distinction between priests and people was clearly marked among the Hebrews]. The term arose when the officers of the congregation became prominent, and when that development began which culminated in the monarchical episcopacy. The expression first occurs, as applied to the congregation in the First Epistle of Clement (*ANF*, i. 16), denoting, as in the body politic, the subjects in contrast with the rulers, the clergy. At the head of the clergy stood the bishop, who appointed the rest of the clergy, and installed them in office by the act of ordination. All ceremonial functions were reserved for the clergy and forbidden to laymen. If these principles be viewed in the light of the Apostolic Age, they indicate an enormous innovation, a total revolution of conditions in the congregation. Indeed, for a good while longer expressions, views, and privileges still appear that had survived from the earlier age, and were gradually weeded out as being incompatible with the Church episcopal. For example, the designation of the congregation as brotherhood (Gk. *adelphotēs*), which reflects the view of the primitive Church, was long in use. The right of laymen to baptize was restricted, even from Tertullian's time, to baptism in case of necessity (see Baptism, III. 4); and sermons by laymen practically ceased in the third century, though it should be added that provision for lay preaching was made by the Apostolic Constitutions (viii. 32). For a layman to preach in the presence of a bishop was particularly objectionable (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, vi. 19).[*] The laity's distinctive right continued to be the election of the bishop; though this, too, became gradually circumscribed through the cooperation of the other bishops of the province, and through the rights of the metropolitan. Similarly, the congregation originally had the right to depose the bishop in case of grave shortcomings—a prerogative still exercised in Cyprian's time, though contested as early as by the Roman Bishop Calixtus I. (d. 222). The clergy's battle against ancient rights of laymen is shown in an interesting way by the Syriac *Didascalia* (cf. *TU*, new ser., x. 2, pp. 274 sqq.), the particular issue here being the right of absolution. The same *Didascalia* shows the laity grouped in classes, having their separate places in public worship—old men and young men, old women, young women and maidens (*TU*, x. 2, pp. 68–69). The *Canones Hippolyti* (*TU*, vi. 4, p. 110) give special directions to laymen with reference to their behavior at the agape. H. Achelis.

A word may be added regarding lay representation. Nearly all the Evangelical parties in Europe and America now make provision for lay representation in their general meetings (synods, conferences, conventions, etc.). In Germany and in England State control involves the preponderance of lay authority. In the disestablished Episcopal Church of Ireland lay representation is provided for. In the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States three lay delegates from each church participate in the diocesan conventions, and each diocesan convention sends four lay delegates to the general convention (with an equal number of clerical delegates), which legislates for the entire body. The Reformed bodies of the Presbyterian type amply provide for lay representation in the ruling elders, appointed for life, who participate with the ministers in the presbytery and in the graduated synodical meetings that culminate in the general assembly. Original Wesleyanism made no provision for lay representation. A growing and insistent demand for it led to controversies and schisms. It was adopted in a limited measure, after years of discussion and thorough testing of the sentiments of the constituency, by the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States in 1872. A still more liberal representation (equal to the ministerial) had been accorded to laymen by the Methodist Episcopal Church South in 1866 and put in full operation in 1870. All the Anglo-American congregational bodies (Congregationalists, Baptists, Disciples, Unitarians, Universalists, etc.) have always accorded equality of privileges in general meetings to laymen.—A. H. N.

---

[*] In answer to the complaint of Demetrius of Alexandria the bishops of Cæsarea and Jerusalem wrote that "whenever persons able to instruct the brethren are found, they are exhorted by the holy bishops to preach to the people. Thus in Laranda Luelpis was asked by Neon, at Iconium, Paulinus by Celsus, and at Smyrna Theodore by Atticus." Missionary work was frequently undertaken and churches established by laymen, as in Abyssinia (fourth century) by Frumentius and Aedesius, young Tyrian captives (Socrates, *Hist. eccl.*, i. 19). An imperial law (394) prohibited laymen from discussing religious questions in public. Pope Leo I. sought to curb Nestorian and Eutychian error by urging the exclusion from the teaching and preaching office of monks and laymen (453). Frequent prohibitions of lay preaching in the subsequent time indicate imperfect observance of papal and imperial orders. Charlemagne forbade even the recitation of the lesson in church by a layman. It is probable that most of the prohibitions of lay activity were directed against heretical teaching and that any zealous layman in sympathy with the hierarchy could at any time have secured permission to exercise his gifts. The multiplication of grades of clergy (subdeacons, readers, exorcists, acolytes, sextons, etc.) resulted from the growth of the sacerdotal idea in accordance with which even the more external and mechanical duties in connection with church services must be performed by functionaries duly consecrated, and involved the exclusion of the laity from active participation in church work. With the growth of monasticism and the decline in the efficiency of the secular clergy, most of the preaching and missionary work of the medieval time was done by unordained monks.

Medieval Evangelical parties, like the Waldenses, insisted upon freedom of preaching and teaching. Peter Waldo was himself a layman. Men and women alike who were received into the inner circle of the society freely evangelized. Yet when the party completed its organization there was a clear line of demarcation between the "Poor Men" or Perfecti who renounced property and family relations and devoted themselves exclusively to evangelism and the "Friends" of the evangelists who lived in the world, and supported the latter in their religious work. All the Evangelical parties of the sixteenth century (Lutherans, Zwinglians, Calvinists, and Anabaptists) strongly reasserted the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, and restriction was put upon lay teaching and preaching only so far as seemed necessary in the interest of good order and sound teaching. At present the utmost freedom is given to lay effort by all Evangelical parties.—A. H. N.

Bibliography: E. Hatch, *Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, lecture v., London, 1895; Bingham, *Origines*, I., v (gives citations from original authorities); L. Coleman, *Ancient Christianity Exemplified*, pp. 107–109 et passim, Philadelphia, 1869; H. B. Restarick, *Lay Readers; their History, Organization, and Work*, New York, 1894; Schaff, *Christian Church*, ii. 123–131; Neander, *Christian Church*, consult Index, p. 131; *DCA*, ii. 912–916; and the literature on the Didache and the Apostolical Constitutions. The development of the distinction between clergy and laity is usually treated in discussions of post-apostolic Christianity.

LAMAISM.

Tibet (§ 1).
Visits by Occidentals (§ 2).
Introduction of Buddhism (§ 3).
Development into Lamaism (§ 4).
Characteristics of Lamaism (§ 5).
Tibetan Literature (§ 6).

Lamaism is the name given to the religion of Tibet and a large part of Mongolia. It is a composite faith consisting of a debased (not the classical) Buddhism, which accommodated to itself elements of the early native " bon " (see below, § 3) religion and of Hinduism and then developed its own forms of belief and of government. The word *lama* means a " superior," and is applied by courtesy to all monks above the grade of novice, though originally given only to the abbots.

1. Tibet.

Tibet is a region of Central Asia, bounded south by the Himalaya, north by the Kuen-luen Mountains (which almost meet on the west), west by Kashmir, and east by China. It is a region of high plateaus cut by extremely deep and often precipitous valleys, divided by a lofty mountain range running east and west so that geographers make two main divisions—the northern, inhospitable, entirely unknown to occidentals, intersected by parallel mountain ranges running east and west, between which are valleys and lakes frozen eight months in the year, where the population is sparse; the southern, richer in its possibilities and possessions, several times traversed in whole or in part by western travelers, and containing the sources of the Brahmaputra, Indus, Sutlej, Ganges, Mekong, Hoang-ho, Yang-tse-kiang and other important rivers. The population is estimated at between one and a half and three and a half millions, of whom about half a million are said to be monks. The ethnological affinities, as indicated by the language, are with the peoples of the Himalayas and Assam, but observation points to a mixing with the Chinese on the east and the Hindus on the south. In the settled regions polyandry is the rule, among the nomads monogamy prevails, while the wealthy are frequently polygamous. The culture is of mixed native, Chinese, and Indian origin. The principal points of the history, so far as it is known, are necessarily related in the story of the religion. China claims the region as a part of the empire, and a resident at the capital, Lhasa, is the representative of the suzerain power.

2. Visits by Occidentals.

The first European visitor of record was Odoric of Pordenone (Odoricus Forojuliensis), who in 1330 led a company of monks into the country and reached Lhasa, which he described (cf. H. Cordier, *Les Voyages en Asie . . . du . . . frère Odoric de Pordenone*, Paris, 1891). Of the result of his preaching nothing is known. In 1624 the Portuguese Jesuit Antonio D' Andrada (q.v.) went from Delhi to western Tibet and was kindly received by the local chief of Tjaprang. His success as a preacher was such that the foundation of a cathedral was laid, but the position was abandoned when apparently all was favorable. Lhasa was again visited in 1706 by the missionaries J. de Asculi and F. M. de Torin, who stayed but a short time. During 1716–27 Hippolytus Desiderius and Emanuel Freyre resided in the land, protected by the local ruler against the prejudice of the people, in whom the tendency toward isolation was beginning to show itself. Other missionaries were sent out in 1719 and 1730, but the opportunity to establish Christianity was lost. About 1760 the isolation of the country was brought about, and thereafter entrance was difficult to effect and was usually accomplished only by craft. In 1811 an English physician reached Lhasa disguised as a Hindu and in attendance upon a Chinese general. The Abbé E. R. Huc (q.v.) arrived there by way of Mongolia in Jan., 1846, but was compelled to leave in March of the same year. In spite of the policy of exclusion, reports from Hindus, from Mongolians, and from Russian subjects have made the situation and appearance of Lhasa and its vicinity well known. From nearly all sides the city has been approached by numerous travelers, but access to the capital was strictly barred until the recent British expedition, which failed, however, to reach the Lama, who retired as the English drew near, and finally went to Pekin, where he stayed until 1909, when he was induced to start on his return.

The early faith of the people was the "bon" religion, a shamanistic animism, the deities of which were nature gods and spirits; ancestor worship was an element, witchcraft and magic were dominant, and the idea of transformation was widely diffused.

3. Introduction of Buddhism.

Legends, probably untrustworthy, ascribe the introduction of Buddhism to descendants of Asoka who after defeat took refuge in Tibet. The introduction of the faith was probably due to King Sron-tsan-gampo (b. 617 or 629), who married a Chinese and a Hindu princess, both devoted Buddhists, and at their request summoned teachers and obtained books from India. The progress of the new religion seems to have been slow and the opposition of the old faith strenuous, for about a century later a successor of Sron-tsan-gampo invited the noted Padmasambhava from India to complete the conversion of the land (747), and he is celebrated as the founder of Lamaism. His writings appear to have been the nucleus of a large literature, of which, however, nothing is known. The whole circle of Buddha legends was carried over and applied to him, with fantastic additions to the effect that he claimed to be a greater magician than Buddha, that he overcame the magic and vanquished the magicians of the bon religion, created a magic draft which bestowed immortality, and had a magic horse which carried him to distant isles where he preached his religion to the demons and magicians. The entire trend of the story shows that the practise of Buddhism in Tibet, as elsewhere, was to assimilate what it could not conquer. Buddhism had already developed a series of Buddhas prior to Gautama, and now, in accordance with the Hindu doctrine of avatars, it was announced that Padmasambhava, already regarded as an incarnation, would have successors until the new Buddha came, while the attainment of Buddhaship was to be assisted by the practise of Yoga. For a century and a half the progress was great, but the reputation of the founder became a menace to the king (c. 900), the religion was proscribed, and the monks were persecuted and driven into hiding. Eventually this course aroused the resentment of the people, who rallied around the monks, King Lang-darma lost his life and the kingdom, the power going to petty chiefs and the abbots, while shortly after the heads of the great monasteries came to exercise a power almost regal. In 1042 Attisa, one of these abbots, whose life marks an epoch in the development, invited the Indian monk Vikrasila to Tibet, a period of great literary activity ensued and of moral reformation of the Church. The new teacher united the communities of monks and paved the way for a reunited Tibetan Church. This was first realized after Genghis Khan had united China and Mongolia into one empire (1220–1340), when his grandson Kublai Khan chose as his spiritual adviser Ragspa, abbot of the Sa-skya monastery, became a convert to Buddhism, made Tibet an ecclesiastical state in the empire, and appointed the abbot ruler. This condition continued under eight reigning abbots till 1340. The results were twofold: the conversion to this form of Buddhism of great numbers of the Mongolians, and the subversion of Attisa's reforms and a rejuvenescence of magic. When this empire fell, the Ming dynasty of China gave precedence to the abbots of Digung, Phag-dub and Tshal, broke the preeminence of the Sa-skya monastery and made it subordinate to Phagdub, while the political control was vested in the great monasteries.

4. Development into Lamaism.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century a new reformer arose who is known only as Tsong-kapa, "the man of Tsong-ka." He was a noted scholar, belonged to the same sect as Attisa, and aimed at the purification and unification of the Church. To the monks he forbade marriage and the use of magic, made the yellow robe and the begging-bowl the badge of his sect, took as his three guiding principles pure teaching, stern discipline, and the absolutism of the Church, while the individual's welfare was subjected to that of the organization. He made Lhasa the center of the new movement, and founded there three great monasteries in 1407, 1414, and 1417. The religion received as its governing characteristic the idea of the continued reincarnation of the Boddhisat in the chief abbot, and this incarnation was made subject not to descent, since marriage was prohibited to the monks, but to the choice of the Boddhisat himself, who became incarnate in a babe born after the abbot's death. Tsong-kapa is reported to have said that he would be continually reborn as Dalai Lama. Alongside this official was to be another, the Tasi Lama, the two theoretically equal, but in fact the Dalai Lama the greater both by reason of the larger territory ruled and because he incarnated Padmapani, who is to be the new Buddha and savior of the world. The succession of Dalai Lamas is traced to a successor of Tsong-kapa who in 1439 became the head of the Church and thus gave to the religion its decisive cast. The second of these officials developed further the organization of the Church, and founded a body of advisers corresponding closely to the Roman Catholic cardinalate. Missionary efforts continued among the Mongolians, and the fourth Dalai Lama came from the family of a Mongolian chief. In 200 years the yellow Church became supreme, the red monks sank to a mere faction, while a national consciousness was awakened and bound up with the ecclesiastical order. The Tatar dynasty of China confirmed the ecclesiastical privileges of the order, but since 1750 has kept a representative at Lhasa as a reminder of political dependence, and it is believed that Chinese influence is potent in determining the succession to the chief office and the emperor certainly has the right of confirmation. The Dalai Lama resides in the important monastery of Mt. Potala near Lhasa; the Tasi Lama (also called "Pan-chen") lives at Kra-shis-lhun-po.

The religion centers in the "three jewels" of Buddhism, belief in the Buddha, the law, and the order. It is held that prior to the historical Gautama there were other Buddhas, three of whom are now withdrawn from the world except as guardians during the intervals when no Buddha is incarnated;

5. Characteristics of Lamaism.

a fourth corresponds to the historical Buddha who is known as Amitabha and incarnated in the Tasi Lama; while the fifth is the Bodhisat Padmapani, the coming Buddha and savior of the world, incarnated recurrently in the Dalai Lama, who is therefore sacred. The Buddhist doctrines of heavens and hells is fully accepted, while the saints of the order are objects of adoration. The principle of reincarnation is applied not only to the two heads of the Church but to the abbots and monks, and most monasteries claim to have at least one incarnated saint. Syncretism is seen in the worship of deities and spirits whose disguise as Buddhist saints is transparent, and in the formulas of worship and ritual which retain elements from the bon ceremonial and from Hinduism. Similar traces of elementary religion are seen in the magical charms and the divination which still remain in use. Baptism, confirmation, and the mass for the dead are among the rites of the Church, while the rosary is everywhere found. Especial efficacy attaches to the Buddhist formula *Ommani padme hum,* " Oh the jewel in the lotus." Hence it is ever on the lips of the people, is inscribed on cylinders made to revolve by hand, water, or wind, and on flags which flutter in the wind, each turn or wave being regarded as a repetition of the prayer bringing merit to the owner or maker. Great merit is attached to the ascetic life, hence about one-fifth of the population are in the cloisters. Alongside the reincarnation of the male saints are those of females, reflecting perhaps the influence of the Sakti religions of India. Of two nunneries the abbesses are incarnations of deities probably derived from the early bon religion. Politics has influenced the Church to declare the emperors of China and Russia incarnations of Lamaist saints; curiously, the king of England is not so regarded, possibly because it is the heretical red monks who are most numerous on the Indian border. The accession to the headship depends upon the assumption that when a Dalai Lama dies the soul of the Bodhisat who lived in him is reincarnated in an infant born forty-nine or more days after his death. This infant is discovered in various ways—by the use of the lot, by divination, or, as in the case of the last Lama, by the intervention of a monk of pure life, who had first to be discovered. When found, the infant and his parents are brought to a palace near Lhasa, kept there till the child is four years of age, when he is entered as a novice; at eight years of age he becomes a monk, then abbot and Dalai Lama. In this way the real control of the Church and the direction of affairs is kept in the hands of the advisers, and the Dalai Lama is hardly more than the living idol of the population.

6. Tibetan Literature.

Of the literature of the bon religion little is known, but such as has been investigated is in a native script and dialect, both of early date. The Lamaist literature consists of translations of the Buddhist canon and standard commentaries, and of the Tibetan writings of the monks on encyclopedic subjects. The canon embraces 1,083 titles, an immense mass of writings, which exists in several recensions. The literature includes rules for the discipline of monks and nuns, metaphysical treatises, discourses of the Buddhas, legends from their lives, treatises on magic, hymns to deities, commentaries on the canon and commentaries on commentaries, dictionaries of philosophical terms and phraseology and of language, and works on philosophy, medicine, astronomy, and astrology, translated from the Sanscrit. Many of these are diglots of Sanscrit and Tibetan, and the literature has been translated also into Mongolian, a large collection of the plates of which was kept at Peking and destroyed during the Boxer uprising. The red church literature outside of the foregoing is by the yellow church held heterodox, and the principal work is the book of the legends of Padmasambhava, existing in many editions in Tibetan, Lepcha, and Mongolian. The popular literature is also immense and various—apocalyptic, miraculous, prophetic, and ritualistic. Noteworthy are the works of Milareba (1038–1122), a story of his life and travels, and the " Collection of 100,000 Songs." Both are valuable as pictures of the language and customs of the times. Another monk of about the same period, Kasarrgyalpo, wrote a huge epic on the deeds of heroes assigned to the eighth century, which has been widely diffused in the Mongolian and Kalmuck languages. The principal printing-press is at Nartang near Shigatse, in the jurisdiction of the Tasi Lama. Block printing is done from wooden plates, 12 x 24 inches in size, each block representing a page of text.

The language, while akin to the crude dialects of the wild peoples of the Himalayas, has been so developed by the monks as to be capable of expressing with fulness and precision the sublimest and subtlest thought of India. The religion of Lamaism has made of Tibet a land of culture so far as the monasteries are concerned, but has not raised the mass of the population much above the level of animistic peoples, so hedged about is life with ritualistic and magical observances. GEO. W. GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best account of the religion available in English is L. A. Waddell, *The Buddhism of Tibet,* London, 1894. An excellent though condensed account, covering the literature and the history, is A. Grünwedel, in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart,* I., iii. 1, *Die orientalischen Religionen,* pp. 136–161, Berlin, 1906, cf. his *Mythologie des Buddhismus in Tibet und der Mongolei,* Leipsic, 1900. The account in P. D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte,* ii. 113–117, is so abbreviated as to be misleading. Material is found also in E. Schlagintweit, *Buddhism in Thibet,* London, 1863; idem, *Lebensbeschreibung des Padma Sambhava,* in *Abhandlungen der königlichen bayrischen Akademie,* Munich, 1899, 1903; W. W. Rockhill, *The Lamaist Ceremony called " Making of Mani Pills,"* in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society,* 1890, pp. xxii.–xxiv.; idem, *The Use of Skulls in Lamaist Ceremonies,* ib. pp. xxiv.–xxxi.; Sarachandra Dasa, *Journey to Lhasa and Central Tibet,* London, 1902. Still of use is B. H. Hodgson, *Essays on the Languages, Literature and Religion of Nepal and Tibet,* ib. 1874. For travels consult: G. Sandberg, *The Exploration of Tibet 1623–1904,* Calcutta, 1904; W. W. Rockhill, *The Land of the Lamas,* New York, 1891; H. S. Landor, *In the Forbidden Land,* London, 1898; O. T. Crosby, *Tibet and Turkestan,* New York, 1905; L. A. Waddell, *Lhassa and its Mysteries, with a Record of the (British) Expedition of 1903–04,* London, 1905.

LAMBERT LE BÈGUE: Belgian ecclesiastic; b. in the first quarter of the twelfth century of a family of poor Walloon artisans; d. at Liége c. 1177. Whether he bore the name le Bègue (" the Stammerer "), which is by no means peculiar to Lambert, on account of a physical infirmity is not to be ascertained. As a secular priest he first had charge of a church affiliated with the cathedral foundation at Liége; there he undertook the cure of the small church of St. Christopher, in a suburb of Liége. At the diocesan synod of 1166 he demanded a moral reform of the clergy, especially curtailment of extravagance in dress, and the prohibition of admitting sons of priests to orders. When subsequently ecclesiastical abuses grew worse he vehemently opposed them in the pulpit. At the same time he exerted a profound influence upon the populace of Liége through his penitential sermons. To his devoted followers, the women and maidens whom he had led to renounce the world, he dedicated a number of religious poems in the Walloon dialect; also a paraphrase of the Acts and a translation of Paul's epistles. These writings are lost; but P. Meyer believes he has discovered the Latin Psalter which Lambert used. In his stormy zeal for winning the widest circles to the thoughts of the Sermon on the Mount and imitation of Christ's life of poverty, Lambert vividly reminds of Francis of Assisi; still more so, of Waldo of Lyons. In his sermons he often deviated widely from the doctrine and tradition of the Church. Thus, he ascribed a greater importance to the devout mind and practical love of one's neighbor than to means of grace and ecclesiastical sacraments; he characterized all expenditures for the administration of sacraments and for acts of consecration as simony, opposed pilgrimages to Palestine, and taught that no obedience was due to priests forgetful of duty. In 1175 the clergy of the diocese of Liége, whom Lambert had vehemently attacked, urged an accusation of heresy against him. He was condemned and imprisoned, but escaped and went to Italy on a pilgrimage to Pope Calixtus III., who permitted him to return in peace to Liége. Lambert's most extensive polemical tract, *Antigraphum Petri*, was published by A. Fayen (in *Compte rendu de séances de la commission royale d'histoire*, vol. lxviii., pp. 255–356, Brussels, 1899). In the seventeenth century he was numbered with the saints of the Church. His memory is perpetuated especially by the Beguines, who without doubt were founded by him. At first a nickname, " Beguines " was soon adopted by the societies themselves. See BEGHARDS, BEGUINES. HERMAN HAUPT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. Coens, *Disquisitio historica de origine Beghinarum*, Liége, 1629; Brial, in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, xiv. 402–410; H. Delvaux, in *Biographie nationale*, xv. 158–162, Brussels, 1891; *Analecta Bollandiana*, xiii. 206 sqq., Brussels, 1894; P. Fredericq, *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis hæreticæ pravitatis Neerlandicæ*, ii. 9–36, The Hague, 1896; P. Meyer, *Le Psautier de Lambert le Bègue*, in *Romania*, xxix (1900), 528–545; A. Fayen, in *Comptes rendus des séances de la commission royale d'histoire*, lxviii (1899), 255–356.

LAMBERT, lōn″bār′, **FRANÇOIS:** Reformer in Hesse; b. at Avignon 1486; d. at Frankenberg (32 m. s.w. of Cassel), Prussia, Apr. 18, 1530. At the age of fifteen he entered the cloister of the Franciscan Observants at Avignon. His calling as " Apostolic preacher " gave him occasion to familiarize himself more deeply with Holy Scripture, and he made a great impression as a preacher of repentance and castigation. Under the influence of Luther's writings, which found their way to him shortly after 1520, he left the cloister in the spring of 1522 and went to Geneva and Lausanne, where he was promptly suspected of heretical opinions. At Zurich, in July of that year, he ventured to defend in public debate the intercession of the saints against Zwingli, but finally declared himself vanquished. Under the assumed name of Johannes Serranus he now entered Germany to study the Lutheran Reformation at its source. Having secured, through Georg Spalatin, credentials to Luther and the elector, he went to Wittenberg in Jan., 1523. His sojourn there lasted till Feb., 1524. At Luther's advice he delivered lectures on the prophet Hosea, the Gospel of Luke, Ezechiel, and Canticles; sought to advance the Reformation by translation of reformatory pamphlets into French and Italian; and prepared a tract on the subject of his exit from the cloister and a commentary on the Minorite rule. He was one of the first monks of the Reformation era to resolve on contracting matrimony. In Mar., 1524, he went to Metz, whither he was called by secret friends of the Reformation, but was not allowed so much as once to venture to speak publicly. In Strasburg, whither he turned in Apr., 1524, he found friends, but failed to obtain a position. In spite of his extensive literary activity, his outward status continued oppressive. At last, in 1526, there was opened for him the opportunity for work and the prospect of an assured living. Recommended by Jacob Sturm of Strasburg to Landgrave Philip of Hesse, he was enabled to take the leading part at the Homberg Synod (q.v.). In 1527 he was made professor at the University of Marburg, where in company with Adam Kraft and Erhard Schnepf he served as one of the university's first theological teachers. His attachment to Zwingli's theory of the Eucharist subjected him to much suspicion in Germany, and his French mobility, pragmatism, and easy eloquence provoked opposition, but as a teacher he found great acceptance. His favorite branch was exposition of the Old and New Testament, although his object was not learned exegesis, but practical interpretation and application. CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Biographies are by: J. W. Baum, Strasburg, 1840 (in German); F. W. Hassencamp, Elberfeld, 1860; F. St. Stieve, Wratislaw, 1867 (in Latin); L. Ruffet, Paris, 1873 (in French). Consult further: F. G. Schelhorn, in *Amœnitates literariæ* iv. 307–389, Supplement, x. 1235 sqq., Leipsic, 1730; F. W. Strieder, *Hessische Gelehrtengeschichte*, vii. 378–396, ix. 405–406, Cassel, 1787; F. W. Hassencamp, *Hessische Kirchengeschichte*, i. 65–75, Marburg, 1852; O. Clemen, in *ZKG*, xxii (1901), 133 sqq.; *ADB*, xvii. 548 sqq.

LAMBERT, lām′bārt **(LAMPERT), OF HERSFELD:** Medieval historian; b. probably c. 1025; d. after 1078. It is not improbable that he was educated at the famous cathedral school of Bamberg. He entered the Benedictine abbey of Hersfeld Mar. 15, 1058, and was ordained priest at Aschaffenburg in the following September, after which he made a pilgrimage through Hungary and

Bulgaria to the Holy Land, returning to Hersfeld a year later. The abbey school, which Lambert may have conducted, was a very flourishing one, and his works are good evidence of the height which learning had reached there. The most characteristic is his biography of Lullus, the reputed founder of the abbey, a really masterly performance, written between 1063 and 1073. He followed this with a poem, now lost, on the later history of the abbey, and a complete history to the year 1074, of which only scattered sixteenth-century extracts remain. But his most important work was his *Annales* from the creation of the world to 1077. The first part is brief and not original, but from 1040 the narrative grows fuller and becomes the most extensive account of Henry IV. by a contemporary. In opposition to his abbot and the majority of his fellow monks, Lambert was decidedly against the emperor, and probably wrote the annals with the purpose of justifying the election of Rudolf of Swabia by the Saxon and Church party. He shows little of the conscientiousness of the true historian, but a literary talent remarkable for his age, which formerly led to the placing of too high a value upon his work. In fact, until quite recent times it determined the conception of the character of Henry IV. taken by modern historians, and it is still important for the large number of facts contained in it. (O. HOLDER-EGGER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Opera*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, are in *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum*, Hanover, 1894, where mention is made of earlier editions and literature. Consult: A. Eigenbrodt, *Lampert von Hersfeld und die neuere Quellenforschung*, Cassel, 1896; idem, *Lampert von Hersfeld und die Wortauslegung*, Leipsic, 1896; Wattenbach, *DGQ*, ii. 97–109; Rettberg, *KD*, i. 602; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xiii. 399–401.

LAMBETH, lam′beth, **ARTICLES:** A series of nine articles drawn up in 1595 to supplement the Thirty-nine Articles by stating the doctrine of predestination in terms more explicit and incisive than were used in art. xvii. of 1571, which admits of both a Calvinistic and an anti-Calvinistic interpretation. Toward the close of Elizabeth's reign Calvinism had many sympathizers in England, not only among the Puritans, but also in the Established Church. Calvinistic theology was ably advocated at Cambridge by Thomas Cartwright, William Perkins and William Whitaker (q.v.). On the other hand Peter Baro (q.v.) taught anti-Calvinism. He found an ally in William Barrett, fellow of Gonville and Caius, who on Apr. 29, 1595, sharply attacked Calvin, Beza, Peter Martyr, and others in a sermon which he preached for his bachelor's degree. A lively controversy followed at Cambridge, Barrett being forced to recant, and the matter was referred to Archbishop Whitgift. Whitaker drew up nine articles strongly and harshly Calvinistic as an interpretation of art. xvii. of the Thirty-nine Articles; and, after some modifications of language by the archbishop, they were signed by Whitgift, Bishop Fletcher of London, Bishop Vaughan of Bangor, and others at a conference at Lambeth Palace Nov. 20, 1595. Archbishop Hutton of York later added his assent. Whitgift sent the articles to Cambridge as an admissible interpretation of art. xvii., hoping thereby to allay the controversy and deal a blow at Puritanism by making concessions to the Calvinists of the Church of England. Though he was moderately Calvinistic in doctrine he was strongly opposed to the Geneva polity, and he was too good a churchman to insist on the articles when the queen expressed disapproval, being displeased because the conference had been held without her consent and impatient with both sides for stirring up controversy. Consequently the articles were soon withdrawn—a measure rendered easier by the death of Whitaker two weeks after the conference.

The Lambeth Articles state in the most explicit terms that God from eternity has destined a part of the human race for life, another part for death, and that the "moving cause" of "predestination to life" is nothing whatever in the individual—neither "the foresight of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of anything that is in the person predestinated"; the cause is "solely the good will and pleasure of God." In different forms of expression it is declared that the twofold decree has made two distinct classes of men. But it is not said—doubtless intentionally—that God's decree occasioned the Fall; the implication is rather infralapsarian. At the Hampton Court Conference (q.v.) in 1604 the Puritans asked in vain that the Lambeth Articles be recognized. They were incorporated in the Irish Articles of 1615 (see IRISH ARTICLES). (F. KATTENBUSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Schaff, *Creeds*, i. 658–662, iii. 523–525; J. H. Overton, *The Church in England*, i. 481–483, London, 1897 (where the articles are given); and especially J. Strype, *The Life and Acts of . . . John Whitgift*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1822.

LAMBETH CONFERENCE (also called the **Pan-Anglican Synod**): A gathering held at Lambeth Palace approximately every ten years under the presidency of the archbishop of Canterbury, and composed of all the bishops of the Anglican Communion. The first suggestion of such an assembly is said to have come from Bishop Hopkins of Vermont in 1851, but the earliest official action in that direction was taken by the provincial synod of Canada in 1865. The matter was brought to the attention of the convocation of Canterbury in the following year, and the first call was issued by Archbishop Longley in 1867. In September of that year seventy-six bishops assembled at Lambeth and discussed various questions affecting the organization and work of the Anglican Communion as a whole. The second conference was held in 1878, under the presidency of Archbishop Tait, attended by 100 bishops; the third in 1888, with 145 in attendance, presided over by Archbishop Benson; the fourth in 1897, under Archbishop Temple, with 194 bishops; and the fifth in 1908. The bishops carefully disclaim any legislative or synodical authority, but their deliberations and resolutions have a wide and increasing effect upon the action of the various national churches represented. The largest general interest attaches to the step taken by them in 1888, when they sanctioned, with some final modifications, the statement as to the basis of a possible reunion of Christendom put forth by the general convention of the American Episcopal

Church in 1886; for the text of the statement, commonly known as the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, see Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity, § 4.

Bibliography: R. T. Davidson, *The Lambeth Conferences of 1867, 1878, and 1888, with the Official Reports*, new ed., London, 1896; idem, *Origin and Hist. of the Lambeth Conferences of 1867 and 1878*, ib. 1888. The encyclical letters and reports are published in tract form by the S. P. C. K., London; *Lambeth Conference of 1907*, London, 1907; *Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion . . . 1908, . . . Encyclical*, ib., 1908.

LAMBRUSCHINI, lām-brūs-kî′nî, **LUIGI:** Cardinal and statesman; b. at Genoa May 6, 1776; d. at Rome May 8, 1854. He early entered the Barnabite Order, and rose to high rank in his order, afterward in ecclesiastical diplomacy. With Ercole Consalvi (q.v.) he represented the Curia's interests at the Congress of Vienna in 1818, and after his return, as secretary of the Congregation for Extraordinary Affairs, he conducted negotiations over concordats with Bavaria and Naples (see Concordats and Delimiting Bulls, VI. 2, § 2; VI. 3). In 1819 he was made archbishop of Genoa; and in 1823 he was sent as papal nuncio to Paris, where he successfully labored to make Ultramontanism (q.v.) dominant in France, and this, too, upon the fundamental ground of legitimacy. In 1831 he was made cardinal by Gregory XVI., and in 1836 secretary of state for foreign affairs. It was in Lambruschini that the reaction now centered. Wherever measures were devised, or where efforts were forward which reflected the tendency of the modern era, he perceived revolution. Hence, too, he strictly opposed the strivings toward unity and freedom within the States of the Church; the prisons were filled, and previously granted concessions were set at nought. In the Prussian government's conflict with the Curia, 1836–38 (see Droste-Vischering), Lambruschini vindicated the standpoint of the Curia and drafted the state papers against Prussia (Rome, 1838; German text, Augsburg, 1839). When ultimately the government of Gregory XVI. became extremely odious Lambruschini had to bear the blame for it. Although he had seen to it that only his adherents should be admitted to the college of cardinals, so strong became the feeling against him, that when it came to electing a successor to Gregory XVI., he received only ten votes. Under Pius IX. he adorned high positions, but never regained his influence.

K. Benrath.

Bibliography: Lambruschini was the author of *Opere spirituali*, Rome, 1836 (an ascetic work); *Sull' immacolato concepimento di Maria*, ib. 1843, Eng. transl., *A Polemical Dissertation on the Immaculate Conception of the most Blessed Virgin Mary*, London, 1855. Consult: L. C. Farini, *Lo Stato romano 1815–1850*, i. 78 sqq., Turin, 1850; F. Gualterio, *Gli ultimi rivolgimenti italiani*, vol. i., Florence, 1850; H. Reuchlin, *Geschichte Italiens*, vol. i., Leipsic, 1860; F. Nippold, *The Papacy in the 19th Century*, pp. 98–115, New York, 1900.

LAMENNAIS, lā″men″nê′, **HUGUES FÉLICITÉ ROBERT DE:** A prominent French Roman Catholic theological author, of an increasingly liberal type; b. at Saint-Malo (on the English Channel, 200 m. w. of Paris) July 19, 1782; d. in Paris Feb. 27, 1854. His childhood was marked by piety of the strict Breton type and great devotion to study. In 1808 he appeared as a defender of the papal authority in his *Réflexions sur l'état de l'église en France pendant le XVIIIme siècle et sur la situation actuelle*, which Napoleon's government attempted to suppress. In 1811 he entered the seminary of Saint-Malo to study for the priesthood. In the *Tradition de l'église sur l'institution des évêques* (Paris, 1814), written jointly with his brother, he exulted over Napoleon's downfall, and on the return from Elba sought safety in England during the " hundred days." In 1816 he was ordained, and continued to write articles in the Roman Catholic and legitimist papers, especially against deism. In 1817 appeared the first volume of his principal work, the *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion* (Eng. transl., *Essay on Indifference in Matters of Religion*, London, 1895), intended to do the work of combating the prevalent indifference to religion and arousing interest in the Christian cause. Three more volumes (1820–24) stirred up much excitement, and called forth bitter accusations on the part of the Jesuits, while the Gallican bishops and the Sorbonne were lukewarm in their approval. In 1824 Lamennais visited Rome, and declined the offer of a cardinal's hat made by Leo XII. His treatise *De la religion considérée dans ses rapports avec l'ordre politique et civil* (1826) was still more displeasing to the Gallican party and, in spite of the eloquence of his advocate, Berryer, suffered a judicial condemnation. He now became more and more disaffected to the Bourbons, whose fall he predicted in his next work, *Des progrès de la révolution et de la guerre contre l'église* (1829). In this he advocated the separation of the Church from the State which oppressed and fettered it, and more freedom for the people as well as for the Church. After the July revolution of 1830 he began to publish *L'Avenir*, a newspaper whose motto was " God and freedom; the pope and the people." The bishops now began to bring formal charges against Lamennais; he went to Rome with Lacordaire and Montalembert in 1832, but found little support, and their ideas were condemned by the new pope, Gregory XVI., in his encyclical of Aug. 15. The publication of *L'Avenir* was abandoned. Lamennais retired to La Chênaie, and gave way to the logical development of his liberal principles, marking a definite breach with Rome by the publication of *Paroles d'un croyant* (1834; Eng. transl., *The Words of a Believer*, London, 1834, 1845, 1848, 1891), which was condemned by a fresh encyclical of July 7, but made a deep impression on the people, whom he addressed in its glowing words of hope and love. His *Livre du peuple* (1837; Eng. transl., *The Book of the People*, London, 1838) reminds them not only of their rights but of their duties in the tone of an inspired prophet. This was followed by a number of fugitive writings of democratic tendency, of which *Le Pays et le gouvernement* cost him a fine of two thousand francs. He attempted to bring his new ideas into harmony with his original principles in the *Esquisse d'une philosophie* (4 vols., 1841–46), according to which the truth is determined, not as in his first book by the Church, but by human reason, examining, judging, and confirming. The revolution of 1848 brought him fresh hopes and fresh disappointments. He was elected to the National Assembly, and laid before it the project of a constitution which was considered beautiful but impracticable. After the *coup d'état* (1851) he spent the short remainder of his life in retirement. He had a noble and active nature, never content unless at work. His unselfish piety and humility were unquestioned; but the failure of all his plans so embittered a positive and passionate disposition as to lead him far away from the principles with which he began his life, into a position which his early associates considered little short of apostasy. His *Œuvres complètes* were issued in twelve volumes at Paris, 1836–37; six volumes of *Œuvres posthumes* appeared in 1855–1859 and two of *Œuvres inédites* in 1866.

(C. Pfender.)

Bibliography: Biographical material may be found in: A. Blaize, *Essai biographique sur Lamennais*, Paris, 1858; J. M. Peigné, *Lamennais, sa vie intime à la Chênaie*, Paris, 1864; E. Dowden, in *Fortnightly Review*, xi (1869), pp. 1–26; C. Beard, in *Theological Review*, x (1873), 341 sqq., xi (1874), 70 sqq.; G. J. Harney, in *Open Court*, v (1891), 2959–62; H. Gibson, *L'Abbé de Lamennais*, London, 1899; C. Boutard, *Lamennais, sa vie et ses doctrines*, vols. i.–ii., Paris, 1905–08. For study of his thought consult: T. Passa, *Étude sur Lamennais*, Paris, 1856; M. Lami, *Philosophie de Lamennais*, ib. 1867; O. Bordage, *La Philosophie de Lamennais*, Strasburg, 1869; P. Janet, *La Philosophie de Lamennais*, Paris, 1890; E. Spuller, *Lamennais; étude d'histoire politique et religieuse*, ib. 1892; F. Brunetière, *Nouveaux essais sur la littérature contemporaine*, ib. 1895; A. Molien et F. Deune, *Lamennais; . . . ses idées*, ib. 1899.

LAMMAS-DAY: The English name for the festival of St. Peter's Chains, Aug. 1, which commemorates the imprisonment and miraculous deliverance of the apostle (Acts xii. 3–19). The ancient vernacular English name is derived from the custom in England of celebrating at that time a thanksgiving for the wheat-harvest, and offering the "first-fruits" in the form of loaves of bread; whence the Middle English *lammasse*, from the Anglo-Saxon *hlammæsse*, "loaf-mass."

LAMPE, lām′pe, **FRIEDRICH ADOLF:** German Reformed theologian; b. at Detmold Feb. 19, 1683; d. at Bremen Dec. 8, 1729. He studied in Bremen 1698–1702, and at the University of Franeker 1702–03. In 1703 he was called as preacher to Weeze near Cleves, in 1706 to Duisburg, and in 1709 to the church of St. Stephen in Bremen. From 1720 to 1727 he was professor of dogmatics and church history at Utrecht; and from 1727 till his death he was pastor of St. Ansgar's and professor at the gymnasium in Bremen. From his schools in Bremen and Utrecht proceeded a great number of men who exerted a salutary influence in all spheres of life in the Reformed Church. Lampe's theology was essentially Biblical; and it was his great merit to further Bible study in the Reformed Church, and to revive the federal theology (see Cocceius, Johannes). His most important work is *Geheimnis des Gnadenbundes, dem grossen Bundesgott zu Ehren und allen heilbegierigen Seelen zur Erbauung geöffnet* (6 vols., Bremen, 1712 seq.; Dutch transl., 1727). The first volume treats of the "nature of the covenant of grace" and entirely follows the fundamental conceptions of Cocceius. The following volumes trace the church of God historically through the threefold economy of the covenant of grace under the promise (vol. ii.), the law (vols. iii. and iv.), and the Gospel (vols. v. and vi.). Lampe adopted the systematic form which Frans Burmann had given to the federal theology. In this framework the whole content of theology is presented, but only in its results for practical Christian life, and in a form intelligible to all persons versed in the Bible. It is owing to Lampe's peculiar union of theory and practise that his spirit as that of no other theologian entered the congregations, while the history of theological science took little notice of him. In the doctrine of the order of salvation Lampe gave to Calvinism and Cocceianism a new and peculiarly Pietistic turn, by emphasizing the Pietistic attention to the inner life of the individual and the pressure of personal decision, but the fundamental view of Calvinism guarded him against all excesses of Pietistic individualism. The Church was for him a divine institution, and he was averse to all separatistic tendencies. Very popular have been his catechisms: *Milch der Wahrheit, nach Anleitung des Heidelberger Katechismus* (1718); *Einleitung zu dem Geheimnis des Gnadenbundes; Erste Wahrheitsmilch für Säuglinge am Alter und Verstand;* also his excellent book on communion, *Der heilige Brautschmuck der Hochzeit-Gäste des Lammes an seiner Bundestafel* (Bremen, 1720). He also wrote: *Commentarius analytico-exegeticus in Evangelium secundum Johannem* (3 vols., Amsterdam, 1724–1726; Germ. transl., 2 vols., Leipsic, 1729); *Delineatio theologiæ activæ* (Utrecht, 1727, Germ. transl., Frankfurt, 1728), the first system of ethics of the federal theology; and *Dissertationum . . . syntagma* (Amsterdam, 1737). Together with C. van Hase the younger Lampe edited the *Bibliotheca historico-philologica-theologica* (Bremen, 1718–27). He also took a prominent position among hymn-writers in the Reformed Church.

(E. F. Karl Müller.)

Bibliography: O. Thelemann, *Friedrich Adolf Lampe*, Bielefeld, 1868; H. L. J. Heppe, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, pp. 236 sqq., 479–480, Leyden, 1879; A. Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, i. 427 sqq., Bonn, 1880. An index to his own writings and to earlier literature about him is in A. J. van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenbock, der Nederlanden*, xi. 83, Harlem, 1852 sqq.

LAMPETIANS. See Messalians.

LAMY, lā″mî′, **BERNARD:** French Roman Catholic; b. at Le Mans (130 m. s.w. of Paris), June, 1640; d. at Rouen Jan. 29, 1715. He entered the Congregation of the Oratory in 1658, and became professor of philosophy in Saumur in 1671, afterward at the University of Angers. On account of his Cartesian views he was deposed from his chair at Angers in 1675 and driven from the city. Through the favor of Cardinal Le Camus he was soon given the chair of theology in the seminary at Grenoble, and in 1686 was recalled to Paris as professor of theology in the seminary of St. Magloire. For publishing a book without proper permission he was transferred to the Oratory at Rouen in 1690. His principal works are: *L'art de parler* (Paris, 1675); *Entretiens sur les sciences* (Brussels, 1684); *Apparatus ad biblia sacra* (Grenoble, 1686; Fr. transl., Lyons, 1709; Eng. transl., *Apparatus Biblicus*, London, 1723); *Harmonia seu concordia quatuor Evangelistarum* (Paris, 1689; enlarged ed., 2 vols., 1699); and the posthumous *De tabernaculo fœderis, de sancta civitate Jerusalum et de templo* (1720), upon which he worked for thirty years.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *KL*, vii. 1372–74; J. Poté, *Éloges historiques*, Le Mans, 1817; B. Hauréau, *Hist. littéraire du Maine*, ii. 117 sqq., Paris, 1844; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, vii. 709–710.

LANCE, THE HOLY: The instrument with which the side of Christ was pierced after his death upon the cross (John xix. 31). It was believed to have been found, with the other instruments of the passion, by Helena, the mother of Constantine (see HELENA, SAINT, 1), and in the time of Bede was said to be preserved at Jerusalem. The metal head was carried by the Emperor Heraclius to Constantinople, and later to Antioch, where it was discovered by the crusaders in 1098. Baldwin II. pledged it to the Venetians, from whom Louis IX. of France obtained it in 1239 and brought it to Paris. Here it was preserved and venerated in the Sainte Chapelle, together with the crown of thorns; but since 1796 it has disappeared. The larger portion remained in Constantinople until 1492, when Bajazet presented it to Innocent VIII.; since then it has been preserved in St. Peter's. A second lance was venerated in the Middle Ages among the sacred treasures of the empire. According to some authorities it was the lance of Constantine, containing some of the nails of the cross, while others maintained that it was the actual lance of the crucifixion. The Roman Catholic Church has never, even when sanctioning liturgical devotion to these relics, pronounced upon their genuineness. For the so-called "Holy Lance" used in the Eastern Church in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, see EASTERN CHURCH, § 19.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Benedict XIV., *De . . . canonizatione*, chaps. xxv., xxxi., 4 vols., Bonona, 1734–38; C. Rohault de Fleury, *Mémoire sur les instruments de la passion*, Paris, 1869; *KL*, vii. 1419–22.

LANCELOTTI, lān″chê-lət′tî, **GIOVANNI PAOLO:** Professor of canon law at Perugia, where he died in 1590, and known as the author of the *Institutiones juris canonici* which are appended to not a few editions of the *Corpus juris canonici*. The thought of writing a text-book of canon law on the model of Justinian's "Institutes" had already occupied Lancelotti for some time when in 1557 Pope Paul IV. commissioned him to undertake it. The work was not, however, formally approved by the pope, and appeared in 1563 as a private publication. It was first adopted by Petrus Matthæus in his edition of the *Corpus juris*, 1591. The value of Lancelotti's *Institutiones* lies in the fact that from them it is easy to become acquainted with the law in force prior to the Council of Trent, and with the practise of that age. The later editors have carefully printed out in their notes the differences introduced by the newer legislation. E. SEHLING.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. B. Vermiglioli, *Biografia degli scrittori Perugini*, ii. 40 sqq., Perugia, 1829; J. F. von Schulte, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts*, iii. 451 sqq., Stuttgart, 1880; *KL*, vii. 1376; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, vii. 718–719.

LANDELS, WILLIAM: British Baptist; b. near Berwick, Scotland, Apr. 25, 1823; d. at Kirkcaldy, Scotland, July 7, 1899. His father was an Auld Kirk farmer and fisherman. Converted (c. 1841) under Primitive Methodist influence, he was encouraged by the Morisonians to enter the ministry, and in 1843 began a course of study under James Morison at Kilmarnock, with whom he spent three summers. He was ordained in 1844 and became pastor of a small Morisonian church at Darvel. He seems to have come under Baptist influence at about this time, and when called upon as pastor to baptize infants, his scruples led him to examine the question of infant baptism. Having become convinced that it was without Scriptural warrant, he received believers' baptism at the hands of T. Maclean, of Dunbar, and soon afterward became pastor at Cupar (July, 1846). From 1850 to 1855 he was pastor in Birmingham. His most important work was in Regents Park Chapel, London (1855–1883), where his eloquence attracted large audiences and where he had as members and colaborers Sir Morton Peto, Lord Justice Lush, Principal Angus, and other eminent Baptists. From 1883 to 1895 he was pastor of the Dublin Street Church, Edinburgh, his last pastorate. He published about twenty-five volumes, mostly sermons; among the most important are: *The Gospel in Various Aspects* (London, 1856); *The Message of Christianity* (1856); *The Unseen* (1859); *Woman's Sphere and Work* (1859); *True Manhood* (1861); *The Path of Life* (1862); *Seed for Springtime* (1863); *Everyday Religion* (1863); and *The Cross of Christ* (1864).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: T. D. Landels, *Memoir of William Landels*, London, 1900 (by his son); *Baptist Handbook*, ib. 1900.

LANDERER, lānd′er-er, **MAXIMILIAN ALBERT VON:** One of the most important, though not best known, representatives of the *Vermittlungstheologie;* b. at Maulbronn (23 m. n.w. of Stuttgart) Jan. 14, 1810; d. at Tübingen Apr. 13, 1878. From 1823 to 1827 he studied in Maulbronn, and then went to the theological seminary of Tübingen, just at the time when Baur had begun his academic career, and the transition from the supernatural theology of the older Tübingen school to the Hegelianism which characterized the later was under way. After the completion of his studies in 1832, he became assistant to his father, who was pastor of Walddorf, then a teacher at Maulbronn, and in 1835 in Tübingen. Four years later he was appointed first deacon at Göppingen, and in 1841 professor at Tübingen.

Landerer considered it his task to mediate between the negative tendency of Baur and the orthodox theology of Beck. He tried to show that the fundamental principles of the traditional faith might be maintained without essential rejection of the results of historical criticism or clear and scientific method. In opposition to Hegel's absolute knowledge, Landerer upheld experience in the ethico-religious sphere as well as that of natural science. But the facts of the ethico-religious consciousness are inseparable from the revelation of

Scripture, which again, in its historical development, connects itself with the individual consciousness. The central principle of dogmatics he considered to be the unity of the divine and human by the perfect union of God and man in the person of Jesus, which proves the Christian religion to be absolute. He deviated from the teachings of the Church in his anthropocentric construction of Christology; yet, though placing the center of Christ's personality in his humanity, he sought to bring out the other side by emphasizing the absolute sinlessness and supernatural birth of Christ and the concrete facts of revelation. On the whole, the results of Landerer's dogmatic teachings were of a positive nature, although not in the sense of orthodox exclusiveness. He always kept his mind open for the results of modern science and criticism—to such an extent that it was exceedingly difficult for him to arrive at final results, and he could never make up his mind to publish a dogmatic system. His contributions to the second edition of the *RE* show his talents in the sphere of theology; his article on Melanchthon especially made a remarkable impression. Not less important is that on the relation of grace and freedom in the communication of salvation in the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, which he helped to found. After his death his pupils, P. Buder and H. Weiss published two university lectures under the title *Zur Dogmatik*, with his memorial address on Ferdinand Christian Baur (Tübingen, 1879); P. Lang edited a collection of his sermons (1880); and P. Zeller a third posthumous work, *Neueste Dogmengeschichte von Semler bis auf die Gegenwart* (1881).

(H. Schmidt†.)

Bibliography: *Worte der Erinnerung an Dr. Max Albert Landerer*, Tübingen, 1878; *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1878, part 3; O. Pfleiderer, in *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*, 1878, no. 20.

LANDO: Pope Aug., 913–Mar., 914. His pontificate fell within the period during which the Roman nobles ruled both the city and the papal see, so that no details of his administration are known.

(A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, i. 148, Paris, 1886; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 308.

LANDO, ATHANASIO. See Agapios Monachos.

LANFRANC.

Early Life, to 1042 (§ 1).
At Bec and Caen, 1042–70 (§ 2).
Archbishop of Canterbury, 1070–89 (§ 3).
Writings (§ 4).

Lanfranc, prior of Bec and archbishop of Canterbury, was born at Pavia, Italy, about the beginning of the eleventh century (1005?); d. at Canterbury May 24, 1089. Details of his life are scanty, for he himself left no memoirs, nor was any biography of him written until forty years after his death. He appears to have been of noble parentage, and was educated in rhetoric and Roman law. After his father's death, he left Pavia for a time, and according to some doubtful accounts continued his legal studies at Bologna. Returning to his native city a master of Lombard law, he became one of the three chief jurists of the Pavian school. Probably banished as an adherent of the nobility in the social and political struggles which raged in the Lombard cities from 1035 to 1043, he suddenly left Pavia and settled at Avranches in Normandy as a teacher. Finding little favor there, he soon determined to go to Rouen, the capital of Normandy, but on his way is said to have been attacked by robbers and left bound and blindfolded in the forest. In the terror of the night, he vowed to dedicate himself to God, if he should be freed, and in the morning, when released by passing travelers, he applied for entrance at the abbey of Bec, near the place where he had been attacked.

1. Early Life, to 1042.

The abbey, founded a few years previously by an old warrior named Herluin (see Bec, Abbey of), was both poor and ill-governed, and Lanfranc quickly determined to leave it. Herluin, however, persuaded him to remain and in 1045 or 1046 made him prior. In 1049 he went to Reims, probably to call the attention of the Curia to the uncanonical marriage of William the Conqueror with Matilda of Flanders, and accompanied Leo IX. to Rome. There, at Easter, 1050, he received the hostile letter of Berengar of Tours (q.v.), and at the command of the pope detailed his own views on the Eucharist before the Lateran Council, gaining both their approval and the favor of Leo, who sent him to the Council of Vercelli as papal theologian, thus enabling him to score a second triumph over Berengar. Equally crushing was his victory over his opponent's adherents in Normandy, who were finally expelled from the country by Duke William.

2. At Bec and Caen, 1042–70.

Meanwhile Lanfranc's school was steadily increasing both in numbers and prestige, and enjoyed the special favor of Popes Nicholas II. and Alexander II., so that Lanfranc became the greatest teacher and dogmatic authority of the West. This prosperity was interrupted at the end of 1058 or the beginning of 1059 by William, who, censured by the Curia for his marriage with Matilda, banished Lanfranc from his dominions as his chief antagonist. But the latter appeased the duke by going to Rome and winning the papal sanction to the marriage. The result of this diplomacy so impressed William that he made his former opponent his chief councilor, thus inaugurating a new period in Lanfranc's life. The exact extent of his influence is uncertain, but William's alliance with Alexander II. in 1066 was evidently due to him, and the grateful duke made him abbot of the new monastery of St. Stephen in Caen. In August of the following year William offered him the vacant archdiocese of Rouen, but this was declined by the abbot who, in 1068, went to Rome as the conqueror's envoy to secure a papal embassy to reorganize ecclesiastical affairs in England. This embassy entered England early in 1070 and in the summer appeared in Normandy and announced to the abbot of Caen that he had been chosen to succeed the deposed Stigand as archbishop of Canterbury.

On Aug. 29, 1070, Lanfranc was enthroned as archbishop of Canterbury, where, after a vain request to Alexander II. to be permitted to resign, he triumphed both over the disorganization of his archdiocese and such powerful enemies as Odo of Bayeux (half-brother of the king). His difficulties arose from two problems, the questions of the primacy and the cathedral monasteries. During the last few decades the archbishopric of York had not only claimed independence in the north of England, but had asserted jurisdiction over the dioceses of Worcester, Lichfield, and Dorchester. Lanfranc, after considerable controversy, exacted personal submission from Thomas, the new archbishop of York, but was obliged to prove the ancient and legal inferiority of York to Canterbury to secure the continued supremacy of Canterbury. In 1071, when both archbishops appeared at Rome to receive the pallium, Alexander II., declaring himself unable to solve the problem, referred the matter to an English council, at the same time appointing Lanfranc his vicar. The question was considered at Winchester at Easter, 1072, but the historic supremacy of Canterbury was denied. At the same time an attempt, aimed at Lanfranc himself as a monk, was initiated to transform all cathedral monasteries in England into secular cloisters, and the leaders of this scheme found themselves able to win the royal support. In this juncture Lanfranc, who feared that a double defeat would annul all his influence in Church and State, forged, or had forged, ten papal briefs, as well as a legend and three canons of a council, which he produced at Windsor in Whitsuntide, 1072, thus gaining an easy victory, which won him recognition as primate and metropolitan.

3. Archbishop of Canterbury, 1070–89.

After this victory Lanfranc energetically began to reform and reorganize the ecclesiastical condition of England, beginning with Canterbury. He transferred episcopal sees from villages to cities, secured the independence of the ecclesiastical courts, and introduced continental canon law, at the same time gradually filling the monasteries with continental monks and increasing the severity of their rule. Yet he was no radical, as is seen by his attitude on the celibacy of the clergy. Himself an advocate of this principle, he obliged only the cathedral staff to put away their wives, though he directed that henceforth each of the clergy, on taking deacon's orders, should make the vow of celibacy. Despite his exclusion of the English from high positions in churches and monasteries, for which he seems in every case to have had good reason, he regarded himself as an Englishman; and in this spirit he promoted the cult of national English saints and opposed all unnecessary harshness toward the conquered. Since his victory at Windsor, he was the mightiest man in England save the king, whose chief councilor he was and who entrusted him with the administration of the kingdom during his own absences on the continent.

Yet even this power was insufficient for him, and in 1072 he asserted the primacy of Canterbury over Ireland as well as all Britain, actually gaining it permanently in Ireland and Wales, and for a time in Scotland. But the higher he rose, the cooler were his relations with the Curia. From the very first Gregory VII. was scarcely in sympathy with Lanfranc, who doubtless encouraged William in refusing to take the oath of allegiance to Gregory; while the archbishop seems only to have been waiting for a favorable opportunity to break with the papal court. This chance came with the conquest of Rome by Henry IV., when Lanfranc entered into negotiations with Hugo the Wise, the leader of the Guibertines, but his plans came to nought, and England remained neutral. His great friend, William the Conqueror, died Sept. 7, 1087, and William II. repaid the archbishop's loyalty and energy with ingratitude, so that death came as a kindly friend to save him from deeper sorrows.

4. Writings.

As in character, so as an author Lanfranc was far inferior to his pupil and successor Anselm of Canterbury (q.v.). His few works, which are almost entirely occasional treatises, are as follows: *Liber de corpore et sanguine Domini contra Berengarium*, which consists of two parts, one refuting Berengar's attacks on Humbert of Moyenmoutier and the Roman Church, and the other defending the usual Roman Catholic doctrine of the sacraments, the author's only advance over his predecessors being his assumption that the body and blood of Christ are received even by the unworthy. The treatise is really identical with the letter addressed by Lanfranc, while abbot of Caen, to Berengar, and was composed in 1069 or 1070. A portion of Lanfranc's correspondence during his primacy has been preserved as *Decretales epistulæ*. The *Scriptum de ordinatione sua* was written between 1075 and 1087 and treats of his conflict with Thomas, archbishop of York. The *Statuta*, or *Constitutiones*, of the cathedral monastery of Canterbury, composed before 1084, fall into two parts, one containing the agenda and remarkably similar to the *Concordia regularis* of Athelwold of Winchester, thus presupposing an English source; and the second discussing the administration of the monastery and corresponding in part word for word with the *Ordo Cluniacensis* of St. Bernard. Brief and unimportant works are his *Libellus de celanda confessione*, *sermo sive sententiæ*, and *Annotatiunculæ* (glosses on Cassian's *Collationes*). The *Oratio in concilio habita* and the *Elucidarium*, printed in editions of Lanfranc's works, are not his, and the authenticity of his glosses on the Pauline epistles is questioned, although it may be regarded, on good manuscript evidence, as genuine. The following works ascribed to Lanfranc are lost: *De sacramentis excommunicatorum; Nonnulla scripta contra Berengarium; Laudes, triumphi et res gestæ Wilhelmi comitis* (possibly identical with the work of Guido of Amiens); and *Historia ecclesiastica* (probably the same as the *Scriptum de ordinatione sua*). The influence of Lanfranc was more potent as teacher than as author, although he neither founded nor could found a theological school. Even his most important theological scholar, Anselm, quickly marked out ways of his own, in method following Berengar rather than Lanfranc, who probably taught primarily as a jurist. There is some evidence that he lectured on canon law in Bec, where Ivo of Chartres (q.v.) was his pupil; and it is accordingly possible that to Lanfranc is really due the solution of the problem of investiture, through which Ivo achieved his fame. (H. Böhmer.)

Bibliography: The *Opera* were edited by L. d'Achery, Paris, 1648, and (inefficiently) by Giles in *PEA*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1844, from both of which they were republished in *MPL*, cl. Some of Lanfranc's letters are in D. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, vol. i., London, 1757.

Sources for a life are the *Vita* by Eadmer, in *ASB*, May, vi. 848–952; another life with commentary is in the same, pp. 832–847, also, with Mabillon's text and D'Achery's notes, in *MPL*, cl.; Eadmer's *Historia novorum in Anglia*, ed. M. Rule, in *Rolls Series*, no. 81, pp. 20 sqq., London, 1884; William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton in *Rolls Series*, no. 52, pp. 37 sqq., ib. 1870; Guilelmus Pictavensis, *Gesta Guilelmi II.*, ed. J. A. Giles, in *Scriptores rerum . . . Wilhelmi*, ib. 1845. Modern lives are by: A. Gharma, Paris, 1849 (not to be neglected); W. and M. Wilks, *The Three Archbishops Lanfranc, Anselm, A Becket*, London, 1858; J. de Crozal, Paris, 1877; P. Moiraghi, Pavia, 1889; E. Languemare, Paris, 1902. Further material is found in E. A. Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, vols. ii.–iv., London, 1879; idem, *William Rufus*, i. 1–140, ii. 359–360, ib. 1882; idem, *William the Conqueror*, pp. 141–146, ib. 1888 (all valuable); T. Wright, *Biographia Britannica literaria*, ii. 1–14, ib. 1846; E. Churton, *Hist. of the Early English Church*, chap. xv., London, 1850; W. F. Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, vol. ii. chap. ii., ib. 1862; M. Rule, *Life and Times of St. Anselm*, i. 163–181, ib. 1883; J. H. Overton, *The Church in England*, i. 161–169, 173–175 et passim, ib. 1897; H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie*, Leipsic, 1899; idem, *Die Fälschungen Lanfranks von Canterbury*, ib., 1902; W. R. W. Stephens, *The English Church (1066–1272)*, passim, London, 1901; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xiii. 165–175, 290–295, 440–459; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, viii. 260–305; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iv. 554–572; *DNB*, xxxii. 83–89 (where references to other literature are given); and the literature under Berengar.

LANG, lāng, **AUGUST:** German Reformed; b. at Huppichteroth (near Gummersbach, 24 m. e. of Cologne) Feb. 26, 1867. He studied in Bonn (1886–88, 1889–90; Th. Lic., 1890) and Berlin (1888–1889), and since 1893 has been cathedral preacher in Halle; since 1900 he has also been privat-docent for church history at the university of the same city. He has written *Württembergs Gemeinschaften* (Barmen, 1892); *Das häussliche Leben Johann Calvins* (Munich, 1893); *Die Bekehrung Johann Calvins* (Leipsic, 1897); *Der Evangelienkommentar Martin Butzers und die Grundzüge seiner Theologie* (1900); *Die Bedeutung der reformierten Theologie für die religiöse Lage der Gegenwart* (Neukirchen, 1905); *Der Heidelberger Katechismus und vier verwandte Katechismen (Leo Juds und Microns kleine Katechismen, sowie die beiden Vorarbeiten Ursin's) nebst einer historisch-theologischen Einleitung* (Leipsic, 1907); and *Johannes Calvin, Ein Lebensbild zu seinem 400. Geburtstag* (1909).

LANG, COSMO GORDON: Church of England, archbishop of York and primate of England; b. at Aberdeen, of Presbyterian parentage, Oct. 31, 1864. He was educated at Glasgow University and Balliol College, Oxford (B.A., 1885), and then studied law, but suddenly determined to take orders and pursued theological studies at Cuddesdon, being ordered deacon in 1890 and advanced to the priesthood in the following year. He was fellow of All Souls', Oxford, in 1888–93, curate of Leeds in 1890–93, fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and dean of divinity in 1893–96, vicar of St. Mary the Virgin (the university church), Oxford, in 1894–96, and vicar of Portsea, as well as chaplain of the Kingston prison, in 1896–1901. He was also examining chaplain to the bishop of Lichfield in 1894–96 and to the bishop of Oxford in 1894–1901, honorary chaplain to Queen Victoria in 1899–1901, and select preacher at Oxford in 1896 and Cambridge in 1897. In 1901 he was consecrated suffragan bishop of Stepney, and in 1908, on the resignation of Archbishop W. D. Maclagan (q.v.), was appointed archbishop of York. He has written: *Miracles of Jesus as Marks of the Way of Life* (London, 1900); *Thoughts on Some of the Parables of Jesus* (1905); *Opportunity of the Church of England* (1905); and *Principles of Religious Education* (1906).

LANG, HEINRICH: Advocate of liberalism in Switzerland and Germany; b. at Frommern, near Balingen (38 m. s.w. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, Nov. 14, 1826; d. at Zurich Jan. 13, 1876. He entered the University of Tübingen at the age of eighteen, and there came strongly under the influence of Hegelianism. Nevertheless, he did not go to the radical extremes of the Neohegelians, being restrained by the tenets of Schleiermacher; yet in the great theological struggle precipitated by Strauss, Baur, and their school at Tübingen, he took a decided stand on the side of unfettered investigation. Like Strauss, he accepted the negative results of philosophical and historical criticism concerning miracles and supernatural dogmas; while, like Baur, he held primitive Christian literature and the history of Christian dogma to be a necessary and continuous process, whereby Christian consciousness seeks to explain its absolute content in the formulas given it. Despite his unrestricted investigations, Lang retained his interest in practical religion, but shortly after passing his theological examination in Aug., 1848, a speech in favor of the abrogation of the Frankfort Parliament and the establishment of a German republic exposed him to the danger of legal proceedings, and he accordingly fled to Wartau, in the Swiss canton of St. Gall, where he was pastor 1848–63. In this pastorate he first published a small collection of sermons (St. Gall, 1853), to prove that the liberal theologian, while still maintaining his position, may preach in edifying and popular manner, and may be equally devoted to his pulpit and his studies. His own theological investigations were set forth in his *Versuch einer christlichen Dogmatik* (Berlin, 1858; 2d ed., 1868), showing that the religious principle of Christianity must be revised on the basis of modern science, this principle itself being none other than spirituality as contrasted with the pagan religions of nature, and childlike dependence on God as opposed to Jewish legalism. This work is particularly characterized by its theories of the atonement and Christology, in which the person of Christ is, relatively speaking, eliminated.

With Lang's next work, *Ein Gang durch die christliche Welt, Studien über die Entwickelung des christlichen Geistes in Briefen an einen Laien* (Berlin, 1859), tracing the evolution of Christian religious teaching and ethics from their beginning to the present, he won a hearing among the laity, and in the same year assumed editorial control of the liberal *Zeitstimmen aus der reformierten Kirche der Schweiz,* which he directed until 1872, and then under the title *Reform,* until his death. Despite his open expression of radical views, his eagerness to promote true Christianity on the basis of his modern conception of the universe is shown in his *Stunden der Andacht* (2 vols., Winterthur, 1862–65) and also in his *Religiöse Charaktere* (1862), in which he traces the lives and characters of such divergent men as St. Paul, Zwingli, Lessing, and Schleiermacher.

In 1863 Lang was called to the pastorate of Meilen on the Lake of Zurich, where, without being the nominal leader of the party, he gradually became the guiding spirit of the movement for the reform of the Swiss Church. In 1870 he published at Berlin his *Martin Luther, ein religiöses Charakterbild,* with the aim of aiding the German people to secure independence of orthodoxy. In 1871 he was called to St. Peter's, Zurich, as deacon, and shortly afterward became pastor. Here his ability as a preacher first gained full recognition and activity, both in the increased attendance at his services and also in the approval shown his *Religiöse Reden* (2 vols., Zurich, 1873–75). Here too he was chosen a member of the Evangelical church-council of the Canton of Zurich, and during this period published two addresses *Zur kirchlichen Situation der Gegenwart* (Zurich, 1873). In the first of these he set forth the struggle of modern society with the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and in the second the position between the conflicting extremes of orthodoxy and materialism. Henceforth his battle was waged against the latter, and in this spirit he wrote in *Reform* against Strauss, Von Hartmann, and Albert Lange; while his two contributions to the *Deutsche Zeit- und Streitfragen* of Holtzendorff and Oncken: *Das Leben Jesu und die Kirche der Zukunft* (Berlin, 1872), and *Die Religion im Zeitalter Darwins* (1873), were equally designed to maintain religion in its proper place in modern society. (P. Christ†.)

Bibliography: A. E. Biedermann, *Heinrich Lang,* Zurich, 1876; K. E. Mayer, *Heinrich Lang,* Basel, 1877.

LANG, lang, JOHN DUNMORE: Scotch Presbyterian; b. at Greenock (20 m. w.n.w. of Glasgow), Aug. 25, 1799; d. at Sydney, New South Wales, Aug. 8, 1878. He studied at Glasgow (M.A., 1820; D.D., 1825), was ordained in 1822, and founded the Scots' Church in Sydney the following year. He was the first minister of the Church of Scotland in Australia. At a time when every increase to the population was of the utmost consequence, he was the means of bringing out many thousands of excellent emigrants from Great Britain to the new colonies, as also ministers and teachers for the work of the Church. He represented Port Philip, Moreton Bay, and Sydney successively in the legislative assembly, and was instrumental in securing the separation and independence of Victoria and Queensland from New South Wales. He founded and edited at Sydney at various times several secular weekly papers, and also published several works, the chief of which is his *Historical and Statistical Account of New South Wales* (2 vols., London, 1834; 4th ed. revised, 2 vols., 1874).

Bibliography: Consult his *Brief Sketch of my Parliamentary Life,* Sydney, 1870; G. B. Barton, *Poets and Prose of New South Wales,* ib. 1866; *DNB,* xxxii. 89–90.

LANG, JOHN MARSHALL: Church of Scotland; b. at Glassford (12 m. s.e. of Glasgow), Lanarkshire, May 14, 1834; d. at Aberdeen May 2, 1909. He studied at the University of Glasgow (M.A., 1856), and became minister of St. Nicholas (East), Aberdeen 1856; Fyvie, Aberdeenshire, 1859; Anderston Church, Glasgow 1866; Morningside Parish, Edinburgh 1868, and Barony Parish, Glasgow 1873. After 1900 he was vice-chancellor and principal of the University of Aberdeen. He was moderator of the Church of Scotland in 1893, president of the Alliance of Reformed Churches in 1899, and Baird Lecturer in 1900–01. In theology he described himself as "holding the great Christian verities; liberal in attitude as to creeds, criticism, and matters not entering into the substance of the faith." He wrote: *Heaven and Home* (Edinburgh, 1879); *The Last Supper of Our Lord* (1881); *Life: Is it Worth Living?* (London, 1883); *Gideon and the Judges* (1890); *The Expansion of the Christian Life* (Duff lectures, Edinburgh, 1897); and *The Church and its Social Mission* (Baird lectures, 1902), besides contributing *The Religions of Central America* to the *St. Giles Lectures* for 1881 (Edinburgh, 1881) and *The Anglican Church* to the same series for 1883 (1883), and preparing the homiletic sections on Luke for *The Pulpit Commentary* (London, 1889).

LANGE, lūng'e, JOACHIM: German Lutheran and leader of the Halle Pietists; b. at Gardelegen (86 m. w. of Berlin) Oct. 26, 1670; d. at Halle May 7, 1744. After a youth of poverty, he began his university career at Leipsic in 1689, where he came under the personal influence of A. H. Francke and C. Thomasius. In 1690 he accompanied Francke to Erfurt and thence, in 1691, to Halle. On completing his theological studies in 1693, he went to Berlin, where he became private tutor in the house of F. R. von Canitz, whose poems he later edited under the title *Nebenstunden unterschiedener Gedichte* (Berlin, 1700). At the same time he came in close contact with Spener and other leading Pietists. In 1696 he was called to Cöslin as rector of the gymnasium there, but two years later he returned to Berlin as head of the Friedrichswerdersches Gymnasium, and was also pastor of the Friedrichstadt Church from 1699. From 1709 until his death he was first adjunct and then full professor in the theological faculty of Halle, of which he was rector in 1721–22 and 1731–1732. Despite the learning, piety, and discipline he had evinced at Berlin, and notwithstanding the immense popularity of his earlier years at Halle, he had few pupils after 1730. His lectures, though chiefly on dogmatic and moral theology, also included exegetics and, for a time, ascetics.

Lange's literary activity was more potent and lasting than his academic work, but of his long list of writings (even an incomplete catalogue numbering ninety-five) only those most important for theology can be mentioned here. He began his career as an author by his *Idea theologiæ pseudorthodoxæ,* *speciatim Schelvigianæ* (Berlin, 1706), first as an appendix to J. W. Zierold's *Synopsis veritatis*, and in the following year as a separate work. He then assailed the *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, edited by V. E. Löscher, the orthodox leader, after 1702, with his *Aufrichtige Nachricht von der Unechtheit der sogenannten Unschuldigen Nachrichten* (5 vols., Leipsic, 1707–14). His chief attack on the orthodox, however, was his *Antibarbarus orthodoxiæ dogmatico-hermeneuticus* (4 parts, Berlin, 1709–11); while in his *Richtige Mittelstrasse* (4 vols., Halle, 1712–14) he sought to combat the errors and extravagances of his fellow Pietists. He again attacked Löscher in the name of the theological faculty of Halle with his *Die Gestalt des Kreuzreichs Christi in seiner Unschuld*, etc. (Halle, 1713); and when his opponent sought peace with Halle in 1716 and 1719, it was Lange whose stubborn attitude prevented any reconciliation. Lange now engaged in a controversy with the philosopher Christian Wolff (q.v.), who had been appointed professor at Halle in 1706. Wolff's prorectorial address on the moral philosophy of the Chinese (July 12, 1721), declaring that unaided human reason could attain to moral truths, was bitterly offensive to the theological faculty, and Lange, not only by using his court influence to brand Wolff's determinism and atheism as perilous to the State, but especially by his *Causa Dei adversus atheismum et pseudophilosophiam præsertim Stoicam, Spinozianam et Wolfianam* (Halle, 1723), secured his opponent's banishment in 1723. Yet despite this triumph, which was followed by a series of polemics, such as the *Kurze Darstellung der Grundsätze der Wolff'schen Philosophie* (Halle, 1736), could not prevent Wolff's return in 1740, while Lange was prohibited from making further attacks.

Lange's writings, though highly esteemed by his contemporaries, have now only a historical value. His works on church history, systematic theology, and exegesis are exemplified by his *Historia ecclesiastica Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (Halle, 1722); *Œconomia salutis evangelique dogmatica et moralis* (1728); and *Hermeneutica sacra* (Berlin, 1733), and his two comprehensive works on the Bible, *Biblisches Licht und Recht* (7 vols., Halle, 1729–38), and *Hausbibel* (2 vols., Leipsic, 1743). As an author of pietistic hymns he is best known by his *O Jesu, süsses Licht, nun ist die Nacht vergangen*, and *Herr, wann wirst Du Zion bauen?*

(Georg Müller.)

Bibliography: The chief source is the autobiography, Halle, 1744. Consult further: C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien . . . und Religionsstreitigkeiten*, i. 844 sqq., Leipsic, 1762; A. Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, i. 280–560, Bonn, 1884; W. Schrader, *Geschichte der Friedrichs-Universität zu Halle*, i. 133–135, 200–212, 307–320, Berlin, 1894.

LANGE, JOHANN PETER: German theologian and exegete of the Evangelical school; b. on a farm in the parish of Sonnborn, near Elberfeld, Prussia, Apr. 10, 1802; d. at Bonn July 8, 1884. His father was a farmer and wagoner and brought his son up in the same occupations, but allowed him to indulge his passion for reading. He studied at the gymnasium in Düsseldorf 1821–22 and the University of Bonn, where he was particularly influenced by Nitzsch, 1822–25. He became assistant minister at Langenberg, near Elberfeld, 1825; Reformed pastor of Wald, near Solingen, 1826; of Langenberg, 1828; and of Duisburg, 1832. At Duisburg he attracted attention by his articles in Hengstenberg's *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* and other periodicals, by his poems, and by his book *Ueber den geschichtlichen Charakter der kanonischen Evangelien, insbesondere der Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu; mit Beziehung auf "das Leben Jesu von D. F. Strauss"* (Duisburg, 1836). In 1841, after Strauss had been prevented from taking his professorship of theology at Zurich (see Strauss, David Friedrich), Lange was called to the position. Here he elaborated his *Leben Jesu nach den Evangelien* (5 vols., Heidelberg, 1844–47; Eng. transl., 6 vols., Edinburgh, 1864, 4 vols., Philadelphia, 1872), a positive refutation of the famous work of Strauss, which had a wide circulation and a marked effect upon the subsequent literature on the subject. In 1854 he succeeded Dorner as professor of dogmatic theology at Bonn. In 1860 he became consistorial councilor.

Lange was small of stature, had a strong constitution, a benignant face and bright eye. He was simple in habits, genial, full of kindness, wit, and humor, and was always fully alive to the religious, literary, and social questions of the day. He was a poet as well as a theologian, his mind teeming with new ideas, often fanciful, but always interesting and suggestive. Some of his compositions have gone into the hymn-book. As theologian he was one of the most original and fertile authors of the nineteenth century. His theology is Biblical and Evangelical—catholic. His *Theologisch-homiletisches Bibelwerk* (16 parts on the New Testament, Bielefeld, 1857–71, 20 parts on the Old Testament, 1865–76) in its English form (ed. Philip Schaff, 25 vols. including an additional vol. on the Apocrypha by E. C. Bissell, New York and Edinburgh, 1864–1874 new ed. 1886) made his name familiar in England and America. He originated the plan, engaged about twenty contributors, and commented himself on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Matthew, Mark, John, Romans, and Revelation, giving original and brilliant homiletical hints. Other works worthy of mention are: *Biblische Dichtungen* (2 vols., Elberfeld, 1832–34); *Das Land der Herrlichkeit* (Mörs, 1838); *Vermischte Schriften* (4 vols., 1840–41; new series, 3 vols., Bielefeld, 1860–64); *Christliche Dogmatik* (part i., *Philosophische Dogmatik*, Heidelberg, 1849; part ii., *Positive Dogmatik*, 1851; part iii., *Polemik und Irenik*, 1852); *Vom Oelberge, geistliche Dichtungen* (Frankfort, 1853); *Das apostolische Zeitalter* (2 vols., Brunswick, 1854); *Grundriss der theologischen Encyklopädie* (Heidelberg, 1877); *Grundriss der biblischen Hermeneutik* (1878); *Grundriss der christlichen Ethik* (1878); *Grundriss der Bibelkunde* (1881).

(Philip Schaff†.) D. S. Schaff.

Bibliography: P. Schaff, *Germany; its Universities, Theology and Religion*, pp. 381–388, New York, 1857; *Worte der Erinnerung an . . . J. P. Lange*, Bonn, 1884.

LANGEN, lŭng′en, **JOSEPH:** German Old Catholic; b. at Cologne June 8, 1837; d. at Bonn July

13, 1901. He studied in Bonn, and was ordained to the Roman Catholic priesthood in 1859. After being curate in Wervelinghoven, near Neuss, for a year, he was chaplain and lecturer at the Roman Catholic theological institute at Bonn until 1861, when he became privat-docent for New-Testament exegesis in the university. He was appointed professor extraordinary in 1864, and full professor in 1867. Before his break with Roman Catholicism in 1870, he published *Die deuterokanonischen Stücke des Buches Esther* (Freiburg, 1862); *Die letzten Lebenstage Jesu* (1864); *Das Judentum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi* (1866); and *Grundriss der Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (1868). In the latter work the author's divergence from the rising ultramontane school became manifest, and the second edition, though essentially identical with the first, could no longer appear at Freiburg, but was published at Bonn in 1873. It was natural that Langen should join the protest against Ultramontanism (q.v.), and with his colleagues at Bonn he was suspended and excommunicated by the archbishop of Cologne in 1872. He took an active part in the organization of the Old Catholic Church, drew up the Old Catholic catechism and the *Leitfaden für den Religionsunterricht an den höheren Schulen,* and was president of the committee appointed for the theological interpretation of the question of union with the Greek Church. When the fifth Old Catholic synod in 1878 annulled the obligation of celibacy, he retired from pastoral activity and thenceforth took part in Old Catholic church-life only on special occasions.

Becoming, through stress of circumstances, a historian instead of an exegete, Langen now wrote the book which was to be at once the scientific basis of Old Catholicism and the justification of opposition to Vaticanism, *Das vatikanische Dogma von dem Universal-Episkopat und der Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes in seinem Verhältnis zum Neuen Testament und zur kirchlichen Ueberlieferung* (3 parts, Bonn, 1871–73). To this same period belongs *Die Kirchenväter und das Neue Testament* (1874); but the chief work of his later life was his *Geschichte der römischen Kirche, quellenmässig dargestellt* (4 vols., 1881–93), which extends to the death of Innocent III. (1216) and forms the historic counterpart of his more theoretical *Vatikanisches Dogma.* He promised also a supplementary volume which should contain a résumé of the history of the papal power from the death of Innocent to modern times, but this, though it probably exists in manuscript, has never appeared. In his studies on the development of the papacy Langen wrote also *Die Klemensromane* (Gotha, 1890), while as an advocate of union between the Old Catholics and the Greek Church he wrote *Die trinitarische Lehrdifferenz zwischen der abendländischen und morgenländischen Kirche* (Bonn, 1876) and *Johannes von Damaskus* (Gotha, 1879).

Although opinions upon Langen's scholarship differ, in great part because of the fundamental divergence of the points of view of Evangelical and Old Catholic thought, he was, at all events, an inspiring teacher, despite the fact that personally he was solitary, strongly pessimistic, and frequently over-severe in his judgment of men and conditions. (L. K. Goetz.)

Bibliography: Consult the literature under Old Catholics.

LANGTON, STEPHEN: Archbishop of Canterbury; b. in England (probably in Lincolnshire) c. 1150; d. at Slindon (50 m. s.w. of London), Sussex, July 9, 1228. He studied at the University of Paris and lectured there on theology till 1206, when Innocent III., with whom he had formed a friendship at Paris, called him to Rome and made him cardinal-priest of St. Chrysogonus. His piety and learning had already won him prebends at Paris and York and he was recognized as the foremost English churchman. On the death of Hubert Walter, archbishop of Canterbury (1205), some of the younger monks elected to the see Reginald, the subprior, while another faction under pressure from King John chose John de Grey, bishop of Norwich. Both elections were quashed on appeal to Rome and sixteen monks of Christ Church, who had gone to Rome empowered to act for the whole chapter, were ordered to proceed to a new election in presence of the pope. Langton was chosen and was consecrated by the pope at Viterbo June 17, 1207.

There followed a struggle between John and Innocent III. (q.v.) which brought great misery upon unhappy England. The king proclaimed that any one who recognized Stephen as archbishop should be treated as a public enemy, and expelled the Canterbury monks (July 15, 1207), who were now unanimous in support of Stephen. In Mar., 1208, Innocent placed England under the interdict and at the close of 1212, after repeated negotiations had failed, he passed sentence of deposition against John, committing the execution of the sentence to Philip of France in Jan., 1213. In May John yielded and in July Stephen (who since his consecration had lived at Pontigny in France) and his fellow exiles returned to England. His first episcopal act was to absolve the king, who swore that unjust laws should be repealed and the liberties granted by Henry I. should be observed—an oath which he almost immediately violated. Stephen now became a leader in the struggle against John and none of the barons did more than he to rescue England from John's tyranny. At a council of churchmen at Westminster, Aug. 25, 1213, to which certain lay barons were invited, he read the text of the charter of Henry I. and suggested a demand for its renewal. In the sequel, largely through Stephen's efforts, John was forced to grant the Great Charter (June 15, 1215). Since John now held his kingdom as a fief of the Holy See the pope espoused his cause and excommunicated the barons. For refusing to publish the excommunication Stephen was suspended from all ecclesiastical functions by the papal commissioners and on Nov. 4 this sentence was confirmed by the pope, although Stephen appealed to him in person. He was released from suspension the following spring on condition that he keep out of England till peace was restored and he remained abroad till May, 1218. Meanwhile both Innocent and John died and all parties in England rallied to the support of Henry III.

Stephen continued his work unremittingly and effectively for the political and ecclesiastical independence of England. In 1223 he again appeared as the leader and spokesman of the barons, who demanded of Henry the confirmation of the charter. He went to France to demand for Henry from Louis VIII. the restoration of Normandy, and later he supported the king against rebellious barons. He obtained a promise from Pope Honorius III. that during his lifetime no resident legate should be again sent to England, and won other concessions from the same pontiff favorable to the English Church and exalting his see of Canterbury. Of great importance in the ecclesiastical history of England was a council which Stephen opened at Osney Apr. 17, 1222; its decrees, known as the Constitutions of Stephen Langton, are the earliest provincial canons which are still recognized as binding in English church courts.

Stephen was a voluminous writer. Glosses, commentaries, expositions, and treatises by him on almost all the books of the Old Testament, and many sermons, are preserved in manuscript at Lambeth Palace, at Oxford and Cambridge, and in France. The only one of his works which has been printed, besides a few letters (in *The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury*, ed. W. Stubbs, ii. London, 1880, *Rolls Series*, no. 71, appendix to preface) is a *Tractatus de translatione Beati Thomæ* (in J. A. Giles's *Thomas of Canterbury*, Oxford, 1845), which is probably an expansion of a sermon he preached in 1220, on occasion of the translation of the relics of St. Thomas (Thomas Becket); the ceremony was the most splendid which had ever been seen in England. He also wrote a life of Richard I., and other historical works and poems are attributed to him. It was probably Stephen Langton who first divided the Bible into chapters (see BIBLE TEXT, III., § 1).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources for a life are a Canterbury Chronicle in Stubbs's *Gervase of Canterbury*, ut sup.; Roger of Wendover, ed. H. O. Coxe, 5 vols., London, 1841–49; the works of Matthew of Paris (edited in *Rolls Series*); Ralph of Coggleshall, *De motibus Anglicanus sub Johanne*, in Bouquet, *Recueil*, xviii. 59–120; and the Life of Innocent III. in *MPL*, ccxiv.–ccxv. Modern sketches (a complete Life is still lacking) are: M. Pattison, in *Lives of English Saints*, ed. J. H. Newman, vol. x., London, 1845; W. F. Hook, in *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, ib. 1860–76; C. E. Maurice, London, 1872; R. C. Jenkins, *Canterbury*, ib. 1880 (on the supremacy of Canterbury); F. Phillips, in *Fathers of the English Church*, 1 ser., ib. 1891; and *DNB*, xxxii. 122–128. Consult also J. H. Overton, *The Church in England*, i. 220–231, London, 1897; W. R. W. Stephens, *The English Church (1066–1272)*, ib. 1901; and in general the works on the history of England dealing with his period.

LANGUET, lān″gê′, **HUBERT:** French diplomat and Reformer; b. at Viteaux (21 m. w. of Dijon), 1518; d. at Antwerp Sept. 30, 1581. He entered the University of Poitiers in order to study law, but he was interested also in theology, history, and natural and political science. He visited the universities of Padua and Bologna, and traveled in Italy and Spain. He was greatly influenced by Melanchthon's *Loci theologici*, which put an end to his doubts. In 1549 Languet went to Wittenberg, where he was kindly received by Melanchthon as a guest, frequently accompanying him on his travels and being on intimate terms with his friends. Expelled from France by the persecutions of the Protestants, he settled at Wittenberg, spending the winters there, but making extensive journeys in the summer and fall. In 1559 Languet, on the recommendation of Melanchthon, entered the service of the elector of Saxony as diplomatic agent, which position he held until 1577. The elector sent him to various courts: to Paris, Vienna, Prague, Frankfurt, Cologne, and the Netherlands. As a friend of Melanchthon he opposed the growing party of strict Lutherans; but still he did everything in his power to reconcile the opposing parties, even trying to effect the recognition of the French Huguenots at the diet of Frankfurt in 1562, but without success. In May, 1561, he went to France in order to bring about a closer connection between the German princes and the French Protestants, and was present at the Religious Conference of Poissy (q.v.). In 1562 he was in Antwerp; the following years were spent in diplomatic journeys to France and back to Saxony. In 1571 the elector sent him together with the ambassadors of other Protestant princes of Germany to King Charles IX. of France to congratulate him on the peace of St. Germain. On this occasion Languet advocated the equal recognition of both confessions, but the answer was the night of St. Bartholomew; having narrowly escaped death, he left France in Oct., 1572, and returned there only once more, shortly before his death. From 1573 to 1576 he was at the court of Emperor Maximilian II., whom he accompanied on his various journeys. With the death of Maximilian II. in 1576 his connection with the court of Vienna was dissolved. The bitter feelings against him as the friend of Melanchthon and a Calvinist caused him to ask for dismissal from the court. The elector granted his desire, but continued his salary. In 1577 he went to Cologne in order to be nearer to the Netherlands, as he was greatly attracted by William of Orange.

The leading idea of his diplomacy was that of religious and civil liberty for the protection and expansion of Protestantism. He did everything in his power to advance the union of the Protestant churches. The correspondence with the Elector August of Saxony and with Mordeisen were edited by T. P. Ludovicus under the title *Arcana seculi xvi.* (Halle, 1699). Other collections of letters are *Epistolæ politicæ et historicæ ad P. Sydnaeum* (Frankfort, 1633); *Epistolæ ad J. Camerarium, Patrem et filium* (Gröningen, 1646). His chief work is *Vindiciæ contra tyrannos* (Edinburgh [Basel?], 1579). The book is divided into four parts, each of which proposes and answers a question: (1) Must God in a case of dispute be obeyed rather than a ruler? (2) May a ruler who violates the law of God and devastates the Church, be opposed? (3) How far, and with what right may it be allowed to oppose a ruler who suppresses or destroys the state? (4) Have neighboring rulers a right to assist a ruler oppressed by his subjects?

(PAUL TSCHACKERT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Accounts of the life have been written by Philibert de la Mare, ed. T. P. Ludovicus, Halle, 1700; Treitschke, Leipsic, 1846; H. Chevreuil, Paris, 1856; J. Blasel, Breslau, 1872. Consult further: G. von Polenz, *Geschichte des französischen Calvinismus*, iii., Beilage 6, pp. 434 sqq., 5 vols., Gotha, 1857–69; J. F. A. Gillet, *Crato von Crafftheim*, Frankfort, 1860; O. Scholz, *Hubert Languet als kursächsischer Berichterstatter und Gesandter in Frankreich 1560–72*, Halle, 1875.

LANIGAN, lan′i-gɑn, **JOHN:** Irish Roman Catholic; b. at Cashel (13 m. e.n.e. of Tipperary) 1758; d. at Finglas (3 m. n.n.w. of Dublin) July 7, 1828. After a brilliant career at the Irish College in Rome he became professor of Hebrew, ecclesiastical history, and divinity at the University of Padua in 1789, but returned to Ireland in 1796 and secured the chair of sacred history and Hebrew in the Royal College of St. Patrick, Maynooth. A dispute with the bishop of Cork, who suspected him of being a Jansenist, soon resulted in his resigning his professorship. He was then engaged by the Royal Dublin Society as assistant librarian, and was later promoted to the post of librarian and general literary supervisor. In 1813 he began to show symptoms of cerebral decay, and in 1821 he was removed to a private asylum at Finglas. His principal works are the unfinished *Institutiones Biblicæ* (vol. i., Paria, 1793); and *An Ecclesiastical History of Ireland . . . to the Beginning of the Thirteenth Century* (4 vols., Dublin, 1822; 2d ed., 1829).

Bibliography: W. J. Fitzpatrick, *Irish Wits and Worthies, including Dr. Lanigan, his Life and Times*, Dublin, 1873; *DNB*, xxxii. 135–136.

LANSDELL, HENRY: Church of England; b. at Tenterden (17 m. s.e. of Maidstone), Kent, Jan. 10, 1841. He studied at St. John's College, Highbury, 1865–67, and became curate of Greenwich in 1867, metropolitan associate secretary of the Irish Church Missionary Society in 1869, and was curate of St. Germans, Blackheath, 1880–82. He was honorary secretary of the Church Homiletical Society 1874–86, curate of St. Peter's, Eltham, 1885–86, and lecturer at St. James', Plumstead, 1890–91. Since 1892 he has been chaplain of Morden College, Blackheath, London. He has been an extensive traveler, not only touring the world, but also penetrating deeply into Central Asia, and has done amateur missionary work in northern Europe, Hungary, and Armenia. He has written: *Through Siberia* (2 vols., London, 1882); *Russian Central Asia, including Kuldja, Bokhara, Khiva, and Merv* (2 vols., 1885); *Through Central Asia* (1887); *Chinese Central Asia* (2 vols., 1893); and *The Sacred Tenth: or, Studies in Tithe-Giving, Ancient and Modern* (1906).

LAODICEA, lê-od″i-sî′ɑ, **SYNOD OF:** A Phrygian synod held about 360, its acts being placed between those of Antioch in 341 and Constantinople in 381. The date may be somewhat more closely defined by the seventh canon, which mentions the Photinians between the Novatians and the Quartodecimans; compare the eighth, which alludes to the Montanists. The number of those present is not given, but Gratian speaks of thirty-two bishops, and names as the chief author of the canons Theodosius, who is rightly identified with a Eunomian or Semiarian bishop of the Lydian Philadelphia in 363–364 according to Philostorgius (viii. 3) and in 359, according to Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxxiii. 26). The Laodicean canons are concerned with penance (i.–ii.), the conditions and requirements of the clerical office (iii.–v.; cf. xi.–xii., xl.–xliv., liv.–lviii.), relations with heretics (vi.–x., xxxi.–xxxiv.), divine worship (xiii.–xxviii.), preparation for baptism and fasting before Easter (xlv.–lii.), and the relation of Christians to Jews and Gentiles (xxix.–xxxix.). The mention of female elders in the seventh canon and of "visitors" in the fifty-seventh is also noteworthy. The repetitions in the canons (cf. xxxi. with x., xxxiii. with vi., xliii. with xxii., and xxxiv. with ix.) show that they are a compilation or compend of an older collection.

(Edgar Hennecke.)

Bibliography: Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, i. 746 sqq., Eng. transl., ii. 295 sqq.; T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, ii. 193 sqq., Leipsic, 193 sqq.; *DCA*, ii. 928–930.

LAOS. See Siam.

LAO-TSZE, lɑ̄′ō″-tse″: The reputed founder of the Chinese religion called "Tâoism." He was born about 604 B.C., near the present Kwei-te, in Ho-nan province, China; d. at an unknown place and time, probably at a great age. In 517 B.C. he met Confucius, so that he was alive at that time. He was keeper of the archives at the court of Châu, and it was to learn something about the ancient rites and ceremonies of Châu that Confucius came to him. Foreseeing the downfall of Châu, Lāo retired to a far country, stopping, however, long enough with Yin Hsê, the warden of the gate, to write for him the remarkable volume, in five thousand characters, on the subject of *Tāo* (the "Way") and *Teh* ("Virtue"), called *Tāo Teh King*. Lāo was a philosopher, as his name ("the Old Philosopher") implies. His great work, *Tāo Teh King*, is translated in Legge's *Chinese Classics*, in Chalmer's *Speculations of the "Old Philosopher" Lau-tsze*, and in Carus' *Lao Tsze*. It is, however, not throughout intelligible even to native Chinese scholars, much less to other readers. It may be briefly described as an ethical treatise, in which the duties of the individual and the State are set forth. It lays great stress upon humility and upon gentleness, and, in one sentence at least, approaches Christian ethics. "It is the way of Tâo not to act from any personal motive, to conduct affairs without feeling the trouble of them, to taste without being aware of the flavor, to account the great as small, and the small as great, to recompense injury with kindness." Lāo seems to stand for extreme simplicity, even for the restriction of learning, since when people have too much knowledge they are difficult to govern; even the use of knotted cords as means of record seemed better than written characters. His connection with Taoism is supposititious. The founders of that religion simply used his name and part of the title of his book to give their ideas and practise currency. See China, I., 2.

Bibliography: S. Julien, *Le Livre de la voie et de la Vertu*, Paris, 1842; J. Chalmers, *The Speculations on Metaphysics, Polity and Morality of the "Old Philosopher,"* London, 1868; T. Watters, *Lao-Tsze, a Study in Chinese Philosophy*, Hong Kong, 1870; P. Carus, *Lao Tsze*, Chicago, 1903; I. W. Heysinger, *Lao Tsze, the Light of China*, Philadelphia, 1903.

LA PLACE, JOSUÉ DÉ. See Placeus, Josua.

LAPPS: A people of Finno-ugric race, who from very early time have wandered in the northern parts of Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Russia. In the middle of the thirteenth century Christianity began to be propagated among those in Norway, most of whom, however, long retained their heathen customs. More effective measures for their conversion were taken in the seventeenth century by Erik Bredal, bishop of Trondhjem (1643–72), and at the beginning of the eighteenth by Thomas von Westen (d. 1727; see WESTEN, THOMAS VON), called the apostle of the Lapps. Toward the end of the eighteenth century the mission declined, but new interest was awakened by the work of Niels Stockfleth (d. 1866), who translated the New Testament into Lappish (1840). The religious and moral life of the Lapps improved much from this time.

In Sweden (q.v.) the Lapps came in contact with Christianity during the late Middle Ages. Several of the Vasa kings took much interest in the attempt to Christianize them, especially Charles IX. (1604–1611), who laid the foundation of an ecclesiastical organization in Lapland. In the records of the riksdags during the eighteenth century debates on the Lappish missions are often met with. By royal ordinance of Oct. 3, 1723, it was enacted that all the clergy in Lapland should know the native language, that a school should be opened near all the larger churches, and that books should be printed in Lappish at public expense. In 1739 a special board was created to administer the Lappish mission. Liberal grants from the riksdag and private donations furnished a solid foundation. About 1740 several itinerant missionaries were appointed to teach the Lapps in their homes. One of the first missionaries was Per Högström (d. 1784). Per Fjellström, pastor at Lycksele (d. 1764) published a catechism (1738), a church manual and hymn-book (1744), and the New Testament (1755) in Lappish. As early as 1735 a special school-law for Lapland was enacted. The zealous missionary work among the Lapps of Sweden during the eighteenth century bore good fruit in better religious and moral conditions and an advance in civilization. Of the clergymen who worked in Lapland during the nineteenth century, the brothers Petrus Læstadius (d. 1841) and Lars Levi Læstadius (d. 1861) are best known. New regulations for the church organization in Lapland were made Apr. 14, 1846, and Jan. 31, 1896. The entire Bible was published in Lappish in 1811.

What has been said of the Lapps in Sweden applies also in essentials to those in Finland. Until 1809 the Kemi Lapps were subject to the Swedish crown. Missionaries of the Greek Church began to work among the Lapps in Russia in the sixteenth century and continued in the following centuries. Most of the Russian Lapps have adopted the Greek faith, but their Christianity often consists merely in an outward observance of the ceremonies of the Church. ELOF HALLER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Meylan, *Hist. de l'évangélisation des Lapons*, Paris, 1863; J. Vahl, *Lapperne og den lapske Mission*, Copenhagen, 1866; G. Scott, *Tellström and Lapland . . . with Introductory Sketch of the Stockholm Mission*, London, 1868; A. H. Keane, *The Lapps; their Origin and Customs*, ib. 1885; E. Haller, *Svenska Kyrkans mission i Lappmarken*, Stockholm, 1896.

LAPSED: In the broadest sense, Christians who have fallen into mortal sin and are, therefore, liable either to excommunication or to penance. Commonly, however, the term is restricted to Christians (or catechumens) who, in periods of persecution, either disavowed their faith publicly and explicitly, or, by means not recognized by Christian morals, eluded their duty of profession. There were different opinions in the ancient Church both with respect to the definition of the act itself, and with respect to its disciplinary treatment. The question ran through a long development and was not finally decided until long after the time of Diocletian, but the controversy reached its climax in the third century, especially in the years of the Decian and Valerian persecutions.

Apostasy under Persecution.

Open profession is demanded in the Gospels, and a verdict of condemnation is pronounced against such as disavow their faith (Matt. x. 33; Mark viii. 38; Luke ix. 26, xii. 9). The Epistle to the Hebrews and the First Epistle of Peter, as well as the messages to the seven churches in the Apocalypse, exhort to constancy under the sufferings of persecution. During the first century, however, the danger of relapses into paganism or Judaism was not great. Christian apologists after Justin state that, in general, the Christians continued faithful; and Roman and Greek writers of the second century, such as Marcus Aurelius, Lucian, Celsus, and others often speak of the fanatical contempt of death evinced by the Christians. Indeed, a passion for martyrdom grew up in the congregations, but was regarded with dissatisfaction by the more sober and self-controlled members. That martyrdom might become a duty was generally accepted throughout the Church, the only difference of opinion being with respect to the point at which the duty began. Some considered it legitimate to flee from persecution and martyrdom, while the Montanists declared that every true Christian should seek martyrdom. It must be borne in mind that during the second and third centuries the danger of relapse was augmented. Many fell away, and their number increased with each new persecution. The *Shepherd* of Hermas contains many striking illustrations of the effect which the persecutions of Trajan and Hadrian had on the congregation of Rome, enumerating the various motives of apostasy, and noting that relapses also occurred in perfectly quiet times. The persecutions of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius likewise had their lapsed, while Tertullian's *De fuga in persecutione*, *De corona*, and other works were written with special reference to the persecution by Septimius. What a disorganizing influence the Decian and Valerian persecutions exercised is apparent from the letters of Cyprian (q.v.) and his treatise *De lapsis*. Eusebius throws a veil over the lapsed in the persecution of Diocletian, yet it is evident that the number of apostates was large, and denial was only too frequent in the last persecution, instituted by Julian, although the lapsed were soon permitted to reenter the churches.

Classes of the Lapsed. Treatment of Them.

After 250, different classes of lapsed were distinguished: *sacrificati*, who had sacrificed to the gods; *thurificati*, who had burned incense to them; *libellatici*, who by bribery had procured a certificate showing that they had already fulfilled all requirements; and *traditores*, who had either actually surrendered their sacred books and vessels, or had pretended to do so by substituting others for them. At the same time a change took place in the disciplinary treatment of the lapsed. In the second century it was generally accepted throughout the Church that a Christian who had relapsed into idolatry could not be readmitted to the congregation. The most sincere repentance was not sufficient; only open profession under a new trial and martyrdom could blot out the guilt. In the middle of the third century milder views were adopted. In 250 Cyprian and the Roman clergy still felt uncertain about the question, but gradually a more lenient practise prevailed in the churches of Carthage, Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, and between 251 and 325 a complete system of penitential rules was elaborated by the bishops. Not only was a distinction made between *sacrificati* and *libellatici*, but regard was paid to the individual circumstances of each case, thus gradually transforming the penitential system into one of casuistry. The oldest and most important of such penitential decisions are the *Liber de pœnitentia* of Petrus Alexandrinus, the first four canons of the Synod of Elvira (306), the first nine of the Synod of Ancyra (314), the thirteenth of the Synod of Arles (314 or 316), and the tenth to the fourteenth of the Council of Nicæa (325).

(A. Harnack.)

Bibliography: C. Wessely, *Les Plus Anciens Monuments du christianisme écrits sur papyrus*, Paris, 1908 (contains at the beginning a series of documents of the highest value for this subject); J. Marinus, *De disciplina in administratione sacramenti pœnitentiæ*, Paris, 1651; H. Klee, *Die Beichte*, Frankfort, 1827; M. J. Routh, *Reliquiæ sacræ*, iv. 21–22, 115–116, 255, 256, 5 vols., Oxford, 1846–48; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, i. 279 sqq., 300 sqq., Bonn, 1881; J. H. Kurtz, *Church History*, i. 82–83, New York, 1889; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, and Eng. transl., vol. i. passim; Neander, *Christian Church*, i. 226–246; Schaff, *Christian Church*, ii. 60 sqq., 76 sqq.; *KL*, i. 87–91.

LARDNER, lārd′ner, **NATHANIEL:** English nonconformist; b. at Hawkhurst (42 m. s.e. of London), Kent, June 6, 1684; d. there July 24, 1768. He studied in London, Utrecht, and Leyden, and in 1716 toured France, Belgium, and Holland as the tutor of the son of Lady Treby, whom he instructed from 1713 to 1721. After the death of his patroness in 1721 he remained without a position until 1729, his delivery being too dry and lifeless to gain him the pulpit which he desired. In 1729, however, he became assistant minister in a Presbyterian chapel in London, and remained there until 1751, when total deafness obliged him to retire. The rest of his life was passed in seclusion, although he maintained an active correspondence with scholars at home and abroad.

Lardner's theological position may be defined as rationalistic supernaturalism, since it recognized both the justification of reason and the necessity of revelation. Believing that the original simplicity of Evangelical doctrines had been obscured by useless speculations, he sought to return to plain and primitive truth. His primary object was the proof of the truth of Christianity by historical criticism, this being the basal concept of his chief work, *The Credibility of the Gospel History* (17 vols., London, 1727–57). This book, at once profound and unbiased, is divided into two parts, with a supplement as a third. The first division contains those facts mentioned in the New Testament which are confirmed by contemporary writers, while in the second portion, which is much the longer, the testimonies of the Church Fathers of the first four centuries are collected and carefully weighed, besides being subjected to a thorough criticism which investigates their authenticity and determines their date. The supplement discusses the canon of the New Testament, which Lardner believed to have been settled long before the Synod of Laodicea. He dated the synoptic Gospels and Acts in 64 and the Johannine Gospel in 68, the latest book being Revelation, which he placed in 96. The date of the Epistles was relatively late, since they were written after the Gospel had been widely promulgated. The Gospel of the Hebrews was a translation of the Greek Matthew. Among his other works special mention may be made of the following: *A Vindication of Three of our Blessed Saviour's Miracles* (1729); *The Circumstances of the Jewish People* (1743); *A Large Collection of Ancient Jewish and Heathen Testimonies to the Truth of the Christian Religion* (4 vols., 1764–67); and particularly *A Letter concerning the Logos* (1759), which brought upon him the charge of Socinianism.

Bibliography: The basal work on the life is the anonymous *Memoirs of Lardner*, London, 1769 (by J. Jennings). Consult further the *Life* by A. Kippis, in vol. i. of the *Works* of Lardner, London, 1788; L. Stephen, *Hist. of English Thought*, passim, New York, 1881; and notices listed in *DNB*, xxxii. 147–151.

LA ROCHELLE, CONFESSION OF. See Gallican Confession.

LARRABEE, lar′ɑ-bî, **WILLIAM HENRY:** Methodist Episcopal; b. at Alfred, Me., Sept. 20, 1829. He studied at Indiana Asbury (now DePauw) University (B.A., 1845), and was admitted to the bar, although he never practised. After having been a teacher (1846–52), farmer, and clerk in the office of the superintendent of public instruction in Indiana, he engaged in literary and editorial work. He was assistant editor of *The Methodist* (New York City) 1862–65 and 1870–77, of *The Brooklyn Daily Union* 1865–70, and of *The Popular Science Monthly* 1880–1901. Since 1880 he has conducted the department on "Life in the Churches" in *The Christian Advocate*. He has likewise contributed to various encyclopedias, particularly to Bishop M. Simpson's *Cyclopedia of Methodism* (Philadelphia, 1878), and has written *Education through the Agency of Religious Organizations* (St. Louis, 1904); *How the World was Made* (Plainfield, N. J., 1906); and *Volcanoes and Earthquakes* (1906).

LA SALLE, JEAN BAPTISTE DE. See Christian Brothers.

LASAULX, lā″sōl′, **AMALIA VON:** German Sister of Charity known as "Sister Augustine";

b. at Coblenz Oct. 19, 1815; d. at Vallendar (3 m. n.n.e. of Coblenz) Jan. 28, 1872. She entered the mother-house of the Sisters of Charity at Nancy 1838, served in the hospital of Aix-la-Chapelle 1842–49, and was mother-superior of the Hospital of St. John at Bonn 1849–71. During the wars of Prussia with Denmark (1864), Austria (1866), and France (1870–71) she cared for the wounded and displayed no slight organizing ability. Her theological instruction was received from disciples of Georg Hermes (q.v.), and, like certain of the Bonn professors, she refused to accept the decrees of the Vatican Council in 1870; she was deposed, 1871, and transferred to Vallendar; when she died the usual burial rites were denied to her remains.

Bibliography: Her life has been written by J. H. Reinkens, Bonn, 1878, and H. Lecoultre, Paris, 1879. Eng. transl., London, 1880. Consult also: *Erinnerungen an Amalie von Lasaulx*, Gotha, 1878, Eng. transl., *Sister Augustine*, London, 1880.

LAS CASAS, lās cā′sās, **BARTOLOMÉ DE:** Spanish missionary in the West Indies; b. at Seville 1474; d. at Madrid July 31, 1566. He studied the humanities and law at the universities of Seville and Salamanca, and in 1502 accompanied the Governor Ovando to Hispaniola. He remained there eight years, administering the allotment (*repartimiento*) which had fallen to his father, till 1510, when he entered upon the priest's vocation. While in Cuba in 1512 he became familiar with the harshness of the *conquistadores*, and even then, as throughout his life, he appeared as the protector of the natives. That he might better fulfil this part, he returned to Spain in 1515 and obtained a commission drawn up in the name of the king empowering him to " watch over . . . the liberty, the good and proper treatment, the bodily and the spiritual weal of the Indians " (text in Fabié, p. 58), along with the title of *protector universal de todos los Indios*. Repeated opposition compelled him to frequent journeys to Spain. From the University of Salamanca he received a pronouncement to the effect that it is capital heresy to deny the Indians' capacity for conversion. He himself won the Indians' confidence to such a degree that at his word alone they often voluntarily did what the Spanish lords could not achieve by force. Las Casas wrought subsequently as bishop of Chiapa in Mexico 1544–47. Since his efforts, supported by ecclesiastical means of discipline, encroached far too deeply upon affairs as the *conquistadores* had shaped them to suit themselves, opposition to Las Casas increased; and at home it was even led by the historian Sepulveda, in the atrocious tract, *De justis belli causis* (prohibited in Spain, but printed in Rome). Against this, Las Casas retorted with *Brevisima relacion de la destruccion de las Indias* (Seville, 1552). With more detail he treats the experiences of his own life in his main work, *Historia de las Indias* (first printed in *Collection de doccumentos inéditos para la historia de España*, vols. lxii.–lxvi., Madrid, 1875–76). It is not open to proof that Las Casas is involved in the responsibility for the introduction of negro slavery into America (cf. *Apologie de B. de las Casas* in *Mémoires de la classe des sciences morales . . . de l'Institut de France*, vol. iv. (5 vols., Paris, 1798–1804). There is an incomplete edition of his works, with a sketch of his life, by J. A. Llorente (2 vols., Paris, 1822).

K. Benrath.

Bibliography: The life of Las Casas has been written by M. Pio, Bologna, 1618; by Llorente as an introduction to the *Œuvres de Las Casas*, Paris, 1822; A. Helps, London, 1868; C. Gutierrez, Madrid, 1878; R. Baumstark, Freiburg, 1879; A. M. Fabie, in *Collection de documentos ineditos*, with an appendix of hitherto unprinted writings of Las Casas, Madrid, 1879–80; F. A. Mac Nutt, *Bartholomew Las Casas: his Life, Apostolate, and Writings*, New York, 1909; *KL*, vii. 1437–1441. Consult also W. H. Prescott, *Conquest of Mexico*, book ii., chap. viii., appendix, New York, 1843 and often.

LASCO, lās′cō, **JOHANNES A (JAN LASKI):** Polish reformer; b. probably at Lask (90 m. s.w. of Warsaw), Poland, 1499; d. at Pinczow (120 m. s. of Warsaw), Poland, Jan. 8, 1560. In 1510, probably, the archbishop of Cracow, his uncle, received him into his home, giving him an opportunity for pursuing humanistic studies at that time flourishing in Cracow. In 1513 he accompanied the archbishop to Rome where a council was to be held. He then entered the University of Bologna, devoting himself to the study of theology. In 1518 he returned to Poland where in 1521 he was consecrated priest and became dean at the metropolitan church in Gnesen. But, perceiving with dissatisfaction the deficiencies of his church, in 1523 he gladly followed his brother on a diplomatic mission which led them to Basel and Paris. In 1524 he settled for some time at Basel, where he became an intimate friend not only of Erasmus, but also of other prominent men, who, seized by the new intellectual and spiritual movement, sooner or later joined the Reformation. He became an enthusiastic humanist, seeing plainly the deep-rooted defects of the Church and convinced of her need of a thorough reform; but like Erasmus he hoped that this might proceed from within. During his absence the Reformation had invaded Poland. By the king's order in 1526 Luther's writings were confiscated, and all men suspected of importing them were seized. At this critical time Lasco was called back to Poland; but he labored ten years in vain, to bring order into the confused conditions of the Church, until he finally broke completely with the Roman Church, resigning his offices and leaving the country. He went first to Louvain and thence to Emden where Countess Anna, the regent of the country, entrusted him with the government of all the churches in the country (1542). Lasco succeeded in impressing upon the East Frisian Church the stamp of his personality in such a way that Friesland for a long time was called the northern Geneva. His influence was felt also in neighboring territories, at Wesel and thence up the Rhine to Heidelberg. Although his success was obstructed by the violent opposition of the Lutherans, he remained true to his convictions concerning the truth of the Gospel. A few years later, in 1548, the Interim induced him to leave Friesland. In 1550 he came to England where the duke of Somerset, the lord-protector, and Archbishop Cranmer, the primate, took a decisive stand on the side of the Reformation. Soon his influence was felt in the Evangelical development of the Church of England. The king entrusted Lasco with the organization of a congregation of all foreign Protestants in London. It was acknowledged as a congregation independent from the government of the Church of England, Lasco being its superintendent, assisted by four clergymen. He wrote a confession (*Confessio Londinensis*) intended as a strong defense against the sectarian tendencies of the foreigners, and this was to be signed by every new member; for the instruction of youth he used a catechism which he had compiled in Emden and was not without influence upon the Heidelberg catechism. Lasco exercised a decisive influence upon the English Church, as well as upon his own, also by his highly important work on the sacraments, *Brevis et dilucida de sacramentis ecclesiæ Christi tractatio* (London, 1552). But with the early death of Edward VI. in 1553 the whole work of Lasco broke in pieces. Mary dissolved the congregation of foreigners and expelled them from the country. They wandered from place to place, finding no rest, owing to the dissensions between the adherents of the Reformation. Even in Emden Lasco found no home. He went to Frankfurt, where a part of the fugitive congregation obtained an asylum, always and everywhere taking pains to alleviate the dreary lot of the fugitives' way to Basel, to defend the confession of his brethren as well as their legal status within the Church of the Reformation, and to warn the whole assembly of Evangelicals to unite against their common foe, the Roman Church. On an urgent request from Poland he returned thither in Dec., 1556, with the intention of devoting the rest of his life to the service of the Evangelical Church of his native country. During his eighteen years' absence the Reformation had made rapid progress among the nobility, not so much from Wittenberg as from Geneva since the Calvinistic system of the congregation and of the church government met more readily the peculiar conditions of Poland. But there was no prominent, energetic theologian to bring order into the confused conditions of the Evangelical congregations. Lasco, the fittest man, was in exile. So it happened that the Evangelicals of Poland at the Synod of Kozminek in 1555 united with the Bohemian Brethren, adopting their confession and church order. In 1556 Lasco arrived in Poland. He immediately perceived that the Evangelical Church in Poland needed her own independent development in order to guard herself against the Roman Church in the country, and he spared no efforts to destroy the connection with the Moravians and to lead the Evangelical Church of his country into genuinely Evangelical paths. Until the last moment of his life he had to struggle against great difficulties, on the one side from a hostile party within the Church of the Reformation herself, and, on the other side, from the Unitarians who had gained considerable ground in Poland. His works were collected in two vols. by Kuyper (Amsterdam, 1886). (H. DALTON.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His life was written by P. Bartels, Elberfeld, 1860; H. Dalton, Gotha, 1881; G. Pascal, 1894. Consult further: M. Goebel, *Geschichte des christlichen Lebens in der rheinisch-westfälischen Kirche*, i. 324–358, Coblentz, 1862; H. Dalton, *Lasciana*, Berlin, 1898; idem, *Miscellanea*, ib., 1905; Kruske, *Johann a Lasco und der Sakramentsstreit*, Leipsic, 1901.

LASICIUS, lā″si-sî′us, **JOHANNES (JAN LASICKI):** Polish noble and author; b. in Great Poland or in Lithuania, 1534; d. shortly after 1599. Of his life little is known, but about 1557 he was in Switzerland, where he left the Roman Catholic Church for the Reformed. He traveled extensively, not only as a private tutor and private scholar, but also as a diplomat, being appointed royal envoy by King Stephan Bathory. Later he seems to have returned to his native country, where he occupied himself with teaching and literary work. He took an active part in the extension of Protestantism, the union of the Lutherans, Reformed, and Bohemian Brethren, and the war on Polish Jesuitism and Unitarianism. In consequence of his interest in the Bohemian Brethren he wrote his *De origine et institutis Fratrum Christianorum qui sunt in Prussia, Polonia, Boemia, et Moravia* (written in 1568), later expanded into his *De origine et rebus gestis Fratrum Bohemorum . . . libri octo* (written after 1575). Neither of these have been published, nor are even their manuscripts complete, though the eighth book of the larger work was edited, with a summary of the other books, by J. A. Comenius (Lissa, Poland, 1649). His main source was J. Camerarius's *Historica narratio* (Heidelberg, 1605; written in 1573). The work of Lasicius is still not without value, since much of the material at his disposal is now lost. He also wrote *De Russorum, Moscovitarum et Tartarorum religione, sacrificiis, nuptiarum et funerum ritu e diversis scriptoribus* (Speyer, 1582), which, like his *De diis Samagitarum cæterorumque Sarmatarum et falsorum Christianarum* (published, with his *De religione Armeniorum*, in *Michalonis Lituani de moribus Tartarorum, Lituanorum et Moschorum fragmina decem*, ed. J. Grasser, Basel, 1615; also ed., W. Mannhardt, Riga, 1868), is of great value as one of the few sources for a knowledge of the pagan religion of the Balto-Slavic peoples. (JOSEPH MÜLLER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Lukaszewicz, *Geschichte der reformirten Kirche in Litauen*, ii. 182 sqq., Leipsic, 1850; E. W. Cröger, *Geschichte der alten Brüderkirche*, ii. 100 sqq., Gnadau, 1866; J. Goll, *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der böhmischen Brüder*, i. 74 sqq., Prague, 1878; H. Usener, *Götternamen*, p. 82, Bonn, 1896.

LAST THINGS. See ESCHATOLOGY.

LATERAN CHURCH AND COUNCILS: The church of St. John Lateran in Rome and the councils held in the palace connected with it. The palace was the official residence of the popes for over a thousand years. It was originally the property of the rich patrician family of Plautius Lateranus, but was confiscated by Nero, and later became an imperial residence. A portion of it, bestowed by Maximian on his daughter Fausta, second wife of Constantine, became known as the Domus Faustæ, and she lived there until her husband beheaded her. Constantine then gave it (312) to Pope Melchiades, confirming the donation to Sylvester, in whose pontificate the first basilica was built here and consecrated in 324. It was overthrown by an earthquake in 896, and rebuilt by Sergius III. (904–911). This second church was destroyed by fire in 1308, and a third in 1360. The fourth was erected by Urban V. (1362–70), and still contains remnants of the fourth- and tenth-century buildings. The church of St. John Lateran is properly speaking the cathedral of the Roman diocese; here the pope is bishop of Rome, while St. Peter's is the seat of his universal jurisdiction. Hence the inscription on the west front, designating it "the mother and head of all the churches of the city and the world."

Of the numerous councils and synods convened in the Lateran basilica five are designated as ecumenical by the Roman Catholic Church. These are: (1) The first general council held in the West, reckoned as the ninth ecumenical, under Calixtus II. (1123), attended by over 300 bishops; its principal purpose was the settlement of the investiture controversy (see INVESTITURE) by the confirmation of the Concordat of Worms (see CONCORDATS AND DELIMITING BULLS, I., § 1). (2) The tenth ecumenical, under Innocent II. (1139), with about 1,000 members; to heal the schism caused by the antipope Anacletus II. and to condemn the heresies of Peter of Bruys and Arnold of Brescia (qq.v.). (3) The eleventh ecumenical, under Alexander III. (1179), attended by 400 bishops and 600 abbots and other dignitaries; to end the schism caused by Frederick Barbarossa and to condemn the Waldensian and Albigensian doctrines. (4) The twelfth ecumenical, under Innocent III. (1215; see INNOCENT III.), attended by 412 bishops and 800 abbots and priors; for the recovery of the Holy Land and the general improvement of the Church, including the condemnation of the Cathari and Albigensians (see NEW MANICHEANS, II.). It is notable as containing in its decrees the first official sanction of the term transubstantiation and the requirement of annual confession. (5) The eighteenth ecumenical, under Julius II. and Leo X. (1512–17), with an average attendance of 100 to 150 members; the Pragmatic Sanction (q.v.) was abolished and a concordat concluded with Francis I. for the regulation of the status of the Gallican Church (see CONCORDATS AND DELIMITING BULLS, III, 2 § 1). Other important Lateran synods were those held by Melchiades in 313 on the Donatist question (see DONATISM); by Martin I. in 649 against Monothelitism (see MONOTHELITES); by Stephen IV. in 769 against the iconoclasts (see IMAGES AND IMAGE-WORSHIP, II.); and several reforming synods in the Hildebrandine epoch, of which that under Nicholas II. in 1059 is noteworthy for its regulation of papal elections and its imposition of clerical celibacy. See COUNCILS AND SYNODS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature on the councils is given under the articles COUNCILS AND SYNODS; CALIXTUS II.; INNOCENCE II.; ALEXANDER III.; INNOCENCE III.; JULIUS II.; and LEO X. Cf. *KL.* vii. 1498–1502.

LATIMER, HUGH: English reformer; b. at Thurcaston (4 m. n.e. of Leicester), Leicestershire, about 1480; burned at the stake at Oxford Oct. 16, 1555. He studied at Christ's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1510; M.A., 1514; B.D., 1524), and was at first a bitter antagonist of the Reformation, obtaining his baccalaureate of theology by a disputation against the teachings of Melanchthon. Among his auditors, however, was Thomas Bilney (q.v.), who so influenced him that his antipathy to the Roman Catholic Church equaled his former enthusiasm for it. In his sermons he laid stress on the utter corruption of man and on atonement through the death of Christ, opposing indulgences and the belief in tradition, and urging the need of a translation of the Bible. His opponents now induced Nicholas West, Bishop of Ely, to forbid him to preach in the diocese, but the Augustinian prior Robert Barnes, whose monastery in Cambridge was exempt, opened his church to him, and a large number, including West himself, came to hear him. At the request of the Roman Catholics, Cardinal Wolsey examined Latimer, but acquitted him and gave him permission to preach anywhere in England. In 1530 he preached before the king, and shortly afterward received the living of West Kington, Wiltshire. His sermons caused excitement in his parish, and he was cited to London, threatened with excommunication, and freed only at the intervention of the king, who was pleased with his attitude and talents. At the recommendation of Cranmer, he was appointed chaplain to Anne Boleyn and in 1535 was made bishop of Worcester, where he actively promoted the Reformation. Four years later he resigned, since he would not sign the Six Articles (see SIX ARTICLES, ACT OF THE), and then lived in retirement until detected by the spies of Gardiner, when he was confined in the Tower until the accession of Edward.

He declined an invitation to resume his bishopric and preferred to live in the archiepiscopal palace, where a wide field of activity opened to him, since he was now the confidant of Cranmer, whom he assisted in the preparation of the Book of Homilies (See HOMILIES). At the same time he was conspicuous for his charity and his justice, while he was untiring as a preacher, sparing no hypocrisy and no tyranny. His theology, though his sermons were drawn immediately from the Bible, was Lutheran, but his theory of the Eucharist later became Calvinistic through the influence of Cranmer. His activity was checked by the accession of Mary. While on a preaching-tour he was cited to appear before the council, and refused a proffered opportunity to escape. On Sept. 13, 1553, he was imprisoned in the Tower, being placed in the same room with Cranmer, Ridley, and Bradford. In March of the following year Latimer, Cranmer, and Ridley were taken to Oxford, and on Apr. 18 Latimer was examined, but refused to dispute, basing his arguments solely on the New Testament. After a year and a half of imprisonment, he and Ridley were sentenced to death Oct. 1, 1555, and died at the stake in front of Balliol College two weeks later.

(C. SCHOELL†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources for a life are his *Sermons and Remains*, ed. G. E. Corrie for the Parker Society, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1844–45; and *Select Sermons and Letters*, in *British Reformers*, vol. iv., London, 1830. Sketches have been written by: J. C. Ryle, in *Bishops and Clergy of Other Days*, London, 1854; idem, in *The Bishop, the Pastor and the Preacher*, ib. 1854; W. Gilpin, ib. 1755; J. Tulloch, in *Leaders of the Reformation*, Edinburgh, 1859; W. Beck, London, 1861; J. J. Ellis, New York, 1890; R. M. and A. J. Carlyle, London, 1899; R. Demaus, ib.

1903. Consult also: J. Gairdner, *The English Church in the 16th Century*, ib. 1903; *Cambridge Modern History*, ii. 538–541 et passim, New York, 1904; *DNB*, xxxii. 171–179; and works on the Reformation in England.

LATITUDINARIANS, lat″i-tiū″di-nê′ri-ɑnz: The name applied to a school of thought in the Church of England, especially in the seventeenth century. It is given somewhat indefinitely to men who differed widely in their theological opinions, but agreed in a spirit of toleration toward dissenters, and in laying stress only upon the fundamentals of religion. According to its first representatives, Hales, Chillingworth, and Taylor, attached as they were to the " Church and king " side of the great conflict of their period, the genuine basis of Christian communion was to be found in a common recognition of the great realities of Christian thought and life, not in any outward adhesion to a definite ecclesiastical system. All who profess the Apostles' Creed are, according to them, members of the Church, and the national worship should be so ordered as to exclude none who make this profession. The movement begun by these men passed on into a higher and broader stream of thought with the " Cambridge Platonists " (q.v.), especially Whichcote and Culverwel, who, in a philosophical spirit, dealt with questions touching the very essence of religious and moral principles. They carried forward the cause of religious liberality, and took up and molded into a definite form all the nobler intellectual tendencies of the time. Almost all the influential English divines of the Revolution period, when these principles had free sway, were trained in the Cambridge school, and carried its attitude into the regulation of their public conduct.

The spiritual apathy of the eighteenth century in England has been attributed (as by Canon Perry, *History of the English Church*, ii., London, 1862, 514 sqq.) to the influence of the Latitudinarians; but it may be truer to regard both as alike results of a reaction from the fierce religious passions and prejudices of the preceding age. The temper of the Latitudinarians finds its modern representative in the so-called " Broad-church " party, whose earliest distinguished members in England were Coleridge, Whately, Thomas Arnold, Julius Charles Hare, Frederick Denison Maurice, Charles Kingsley, and Dean Stanley. The tendency to reduce the number of essential doctrines to a minimum and to lay stress rather upon the Christian temper of daily life and earnest work for social betterment, helped forward by the results of the " higher criticism " of the Bible, has become very wide-spread in recent years, in America as well as England, and not only among members of the Anglican communion but throughout all the Protestant bodies.

Bibliography: W. J. Conybeare, *Church Parties*, London, 1854; J. Hunt, *Religious Thought in England*, 3 vols., ib. 1870–73 (impartial); L. Stephen, *Hist. of English Thought in the 18th Century*, 2 vols., New York, 1881; J. H. Overton, *The Church in England*, vol. ii. passim, London, 1897; J. F. Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism*, New York, 1902; J. H. Overton and F. Relton, *The English Church (1714–1800)*, London, 1906; *Cambridge Modern History*, v. 911 sqq.; *KL*, vii. 1504–05.

LATOMUS, lat″o-mʊs, **BARTHOLOMAEUS (BARTHOLOMAEUS HEINRICI)**: Roman Catholic humanist; b. at Arlon (16 m. w.n.w. of Luxemburg), about 1485; d. at Coblenz Jan. 3, 1570. In 1516 he matriculated at the University of Freiburg, where he lectured three years later. In 1521 he accompanied Erasmus on a journey into Alsace, and in Sept., 1522, he was in Treves and defended the city against Franz von Sickingen (q.v.). He had already made himself known as a poet by his *Vita et obitus Maximiliani I. imperatoris* (Augsburg, 1519) and an *Epistola Austriæ ad Carolum imperatorem* (Strasburg, 1521), while he now wrote his *Actio memorabilis Francisci ab Siccingen, cum Trevirorum obsidione, tum exitus ejusdem* (Cologne, 1523). From Treves he went to Cologne as teacher of dialectics and rhetoric, and in 1530 he became a teacher at Louvain, but soon accepted a call to the high school of Treves. In 1531 he was in Paris as a teacher at the Collegium Sanctae Barbarae. Three years later he was appointed professor of rhetoric at the Collège Royal founded by Francis I., and in 1539 visited Italy, settling for a time at Bologna. Thence he traveled to Rome, where his zeal for the Reformation seems to have abated. In 1542 he was appointed councilor at the electoral court of Treves, with a residence at Coblenz. An attempt to introduce the Reformation in Cologne occasioned a controversy with Butzer, who accused him of inconsistency, whereupon Latomus replied that he had never taught the Lutheran doctrine (*Responsio Bartholomæi Latomi ad epistolam quandam M. Buceri*, Cologne, 1544). Butzer responded with his *Scripta duo adversaria* (Strasburg 1544), which was answered by Latomus in 1545. After accompanying his elector to the diets of Speyer and Worms in 1544–45, Latomus was summoned to the conference of Regensburg as a Roman Catholic scholar, where he seems to have written the anonymous *Actorum colloquii Ratisbonensis narratio* (Ingolstadt, 1546). In 1557 he attended the colloquy of Worms, and when the Lutherans accused the Catholics of having broken up the colloquy, he wrote his *Spaltung der augsburgischen Konfession durch die neuen und streitigen Theologen*. This occasioned another dispute with Petrus Dathenus, pastor of the Flemish congregation at Frankfurt, and he also engaged in a controversy with Jacob Andreä on the doctrine of communion in both kinds. In 1569 Jacob of Eltz made him councilor of his electoral court. In addition to his poems and his controversial and occasional writings, the works of Latomus include the following: *Summa totius rationis disserendi* (Cologne, 1527), *Oratio de studiis humanitatis* (Paris, 1534), *Oratio de laudibus eloquentiæ* (1535), as well as editions of Cicero, Terence, and George of Trebizond. (G. Kawerau.)

Bibliography: His letter of June 24, 1533, to Melanchthon, ed. G. Kawerau, is in *TSK*, lxxv (1902), 140 sqq. Consult: L. Roersch, in *Bulletin de l'académie royale de Belgique*, series 3, xiv (1887), 132–176; idem, *Biographie nationale de Belgique*, xi. 424–434, Brussels, 1891; A. J. van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden*, pp. 191 sqq., Harlem, 1865; *ADB*, xviii. 14 (not particularly valuable).

LATOMUS, JACOBUS (JACQUES) MASSON: Roman Catholic theologian; b. at Cambron, Hainaut, in 1475; d. at Louvain, Belgium, May 29, 1544. He was educated at Paris, and in 1505 was called to Louvain, where he was appointed regular professor of theology and canon of St. Peter's in 1535, becoming rector of the university two years later. He protested against the Collegium trilingue founded at Louvain by Erasmus in his *De trium linguarum et studii theologici ratione dialogus* (Antwerp, 1519) and was henceforth stigmatized by the admirers of Erasmus as an enemy of the new learning. Melanchthon and the Lutherans contributed to the general contempt and irony heaped upon the theologians of Louvain and Latomus defended them in his *Articulorum doctrinæ fratris M. Lutheri per theologos Lovanienses damnatorum ratio ex sacris literis et veteribus tractatoribus* (Antwerp, 1521). Luther immediately replied, and four years later Latomus responded with his *De primatu pontificis adversus Lutherum.* In the same year he attacked Œcolampadius and Beatus Rhenanus in his *De confessione secreta* (Antwerp, 1525), and also wrote against Tyndale. He was likewise the author of treatises on various doctrinal problems, and in the year of his death published his *Duæ epistolæ, una in libellum de ecclesia, Philippo Melanchthoni adscripta; altera contra orationem factiosorum in comitiis Ratisbonensibus habitam* (Antwerp, 1544). He was the object of the special antipathy of the Lutherans on account of his zeal against heretics and as the theological coadjutor of Franz van der Hulst, the imperial inquisitor in the Netherlands, in 1522.

(G. Kawerau.)

Bibliography: His *Opera* appeared, Louvain, 1550. Consult: *Biographie nationale de Belgique*, xi. 434, Brussels, 1891; *KL*, vii. 1506–07; *Bibliotheca reformata Nerlandica*, iii., 1905.

LATRIA: See Dulia; Saints, Veneration of.

LATTER-DAY SAINTS. See Mormons.

LAUD, lōd, **WILLIAM:** Archbishop of Canterbury; b. at Reading Oct. 7, 1573; d. at London Jan. 10, 1645. He was the son of a clothier, and studied at St. John's College, Oxford (B.A., 1594; M.A., 1598; D.D., 1608), being a fellow at the age of twenty. In 1601 he was ordained, and in 1603 became chaplain to the earl of Devonshire. His ability was already winning attention, and his advance was rapid. In 1607 he was made vicar of Stanford, Northamptonshire, and chaplain to Richard Neile, later archbishop of York, who in 1610 presented him to the living of Cuxton in Kent, and he resigned his fellowship to enter upon his parochial duties. In 1611 he was elected head of his college. His position there was difficult; the Oxford of his day was thoroughly Calvinistic, while Laud was equally hostile to Roman Catholics and Presbyterians. The Puritan antipathy to him became intense. Robert Abbot, later bishop of Salisbury, made a violent attack on him in 1614, but his stanch friend Neile gave him the prebend of Buckden in the same year and the archdeaconry of Huntingdon in 1615, while in 1616 he became dean of Gloucester. There, with most excellent intentions, he roused opposition by his besetting fault, lack of tact, when he directed that the altar, placed through Puritan influence in the center of the choir, should be restored to its ancient position against the eastern wall. He increased his unpopularity in 1617 by wearing a surplice at a funeral in Scotland. His favor with the king, on the other hand, increased. In Jan., 1621, he was installed as a prebendary of Westminster, and six months later was consecrated bishop of St. David's. It is characteristic of his rigid adherence to what he deemed right, that he refused to hold the two offices of bishop and head of St. John's, although he had express permission to do so. In 1622 the affair of the countess of Buckingham, who was inclining toward Roman Catholicism, required him to define his position toward the Church of Rome, which he acknowledged to be a true Church, although neither at that time nor at any other did he approach or accept its characteristic teachings.

With the death of James I. (Mar. 27, 1625) Laud's real power in the English Church began. Firmly convinced of the justice of his cause, he sought to make the king an instrument in forcing his own views on the entire body of the Church. A firm advocate of the alliance between Church and State, he stressed the doctrine of the divine right of kings until the Puritan house of commons came to regard him as the enemy both of civil and religious liberty. On the other hand, Charles rewarded his fidelity richly. On June 20, 1626, he was nominated bishop of Bath and Wells, and continued his attempts at reform in his new post, notwithstanding Puritan opposition, which he did not try to conciliate. In 1633, on the death of George Abbot, who had been his bitter opponent, Laud became archbishop of Canterbury. About this same time an event happened which was a puzzle at once to the Puritans and the Roman Catholics; Laud, suspected by the Puritans of Roman Catholic tendencies, received the offer of a cardinal's hat, but refused, saying "somewhat dwelt within me which would not suffer that till Rome were other than it is." He entered energetically on his new duties, as head of the Church of England. The use of the prayer-book was enforced, dignity of worship was insisted on, the churches were repaired, the system of "lecturers," by which sermons attacking Anglican principles were fostered, was curbed, and aggressive Puritanism, as exemplified by the polemics of the overzealous William Prynne (q.v.) was checked. On the other hand, his insistence upon bowing at the name of Jesus, and the placing of the altar at the eastern wall of the church, thus distinguishing it from the communion table of the Puritans, as well as his plea for healthful recreation on Sunday as contrasted with Puritan asceticism, were violently assailed. At the same time he incurred the hostility of the queen, who was a Roman Catholic, by his protest against the favoritism shown her coreligionists. As he himself said he was "very like corn between two mill-stones."

In the first year of his incumbency of the see of Canterbury Laud attempted to force ritualism on the Scotch churches, which were strongly Presbyterian; the results were disastrous, leading to riots in the churches, particularly in St. Giles', Edinburgh (see Geddes, Jenny), and ultimately to the renewal of the Solemn League and Covenant in 1638 (see Covenanters). The unfavorable termination of the two "bishops' wars" against the Scotch hastened the downfall of the archbishop, already hated for his activity in the privy council, the court of high commission, and the star chamber. On Dec. 18, 1640, he was impeached of treason by the house of commons, and was placed in confinement, although he was not sent to the Tower until Mar. 1 of the following year. He resigned the chancellorship of the University of Oxford June 28, 1641, and lingered in the Tower until May 31, 1643, Prynne meanwhile seizing the opportunity to print damaging extracts from the archbishop's diary. The trial began Mar. 12, 1644, but the commons perceived that they could not count on the house of lords as they had hoped, and in October they resolved to substitute attainder for impeachment. Under threats of mob violence and the claim that parliament could declare whatsoever crime it pleased treason, the lords finally passed the ordinance, and the archbishop was beheaded on Tower Hill six days later.

Laud was a munificent patron of learning, giving 1,300 manuscripts to Oxford and founding a chair of Arabic which is still in existence. His complete works were first edited by W. Scott and W. Bliss (7 vols., Oxford, 1847–60). According to those of Puritan sympathies, he was narrow, cruel, and an enemy of religion; according to adherents of the Anglo-Catholic branch of the Anglican Church, he, like his king, was a martyr. In his favor it may be said that his faults were those of his age and his narrowness can readily find its parallel among many who opposed him. His sincerity and adherence to what he believed to be right are beyond question, and the same recognition should be accorded these qualities in him as in his Puritan antagonists. He was persistent in his warfare against the Puritanism which he regarded as injurious to the Church, despite scant hopes of success. He insisted on the doctrine of Apostolic Succession (see Apostolic Succession), the importance of tradition, and the return to the primitive Church of the first four centuries. On the other hand, he rejected Roman Catholicism as overladen with accretions not recognized by early Christianity. His stress was laid on conformity in ritual, which, in his judgment, would lead to uniformity of heart, but, on the other hand, he did not insist on absolute harmony on matters of mere opinion. In theology he was an Arminian, and postulated the necessity of good works. Though not the first Anglican to advance High-church views, Laud may not unfairly be regarded as the most prominent early exponent of this school. (T. Kolde.)

Bibliography: The account of the Laud commemoration, with a bibliography of the literature of the subject, ed. W. E. Collins, appeared London, 1895. The main source for a life, outside of Laud's *Works* (ed. W. Scott and W. Bliss, 7 vols., Oxford, 1847–60) is the biography by Peter Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, London, 1668 and often. Modern biographies are by W. H. Hutton, London, 1896; J. Norton, Boston, 1864; T. Rogers, in *Historical Gleanings*, ser. 2, London, 1870; P. Bayne, in *Chief Actors in the Puritan Revolution*, Edinburgh, 1878; Frances Phillips, in *Fathers of the English Church*, ser. 2, London, 1892; C. H. Simpkinson, ib. 1895; A. C. Benson, ib. 1898; and W. L. Mackintosh, ib. 1907. Consult also: A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, iii. 117–144, 4 vols., London, 1813–20; J. H. Overton, *The Church in England*, vol. ii., ib. 1897; W. H. Hutton, *The English Church (1625–1714)*, ib. 1903 (valuable); A. Plummer, *English Church Hist. (1575–1649)*, Edinburgh, 1904; W. H. Frere, *The English Church (1558–1625)*, London, 1904; *DNB*, xxxii. 185–194. A new ed. of the *Relation of the Conference . . . (with) Mr. Fisher the Jesuit*, by C. H. Simpkinson, appeared London, 1901.

LAUDS: An office in the breviary (q.v.) which originally was closely joined to matins, but is now frequently separated from it. See Matins.

LAURA. See Monasticism.

LAURENCE. See Laurentius.

LAURENCE, SAINT: Christian martyr, who suffered at Rome in the Valerian persecution, Aug. 10, 258. He was a disciple of Pope Sixtus II., who made him one of the seven deacons of Rome, and his martyrdom fell four days after that of his master, whose fame he soon surpassed. According to tradition, the Roman prefect, having heard that the Church possessed great treasures, demanded that Laurence should surrender them, whereupon he gathered a crowd of the old, poor, and sick, paupers and cripples, and said, "These are our treasures."

Bibliography: An excellent means of tracing the literature, legends, and institutions in honor of the saint is afforded in Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés, Table générale*, ii. 90–91.

LAURENCE OF CANTERBURY: Second archbishop of Canterbury; d. at Canterbury Feb. 2, 619. He was one of the original companions of Augustine (q.v.), was sent back to Rome by the latter probably in 598 with a letter for Pope Gregory, and returned to England in 601 with Mellitus, Justus, and others. Augustine ordained him as his successor and he succeeded to the see of Canterbury on Augustine's death (604 or 605), but never received the pallium. He tried to win over the bishops of the Celtic Church, both in Britain and Ireland, finished and consecrated the church of St. Peter and St. Paul at Canterbury (613), and translated Augustine's remains to its north chapel. Eadbald, son and successor (616) of the pious Ethelbert, was a heathen and Laurence was on the point of giving up his work and joining his brethren, Justus and Mellitus (qq.v.), in Gaul when he opportunely converted the king (c. 618) and was allowed to stay.

Bibliography: Bede, *Hist. Eccl.*, i. 27, 33, ii. 4, 6, 7; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 61–70; *DCB*, iii. 631–632; W. F. Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, i. 79 sqq., London, 1860; *DNB*, i. 79 sqq.

LAURENTIUS: Antipope 498. He was an arch-presbyter in Rome, the choice of the imperial party for the papal chair, and was elected Nov. 22, 498, successor of Anastasius II. The Roman party chose Symmachus (q.v.). The decision was left to Theodoric, king of the Ostro-Goths, who decided in favor of Symmachus; and Laurentius was made bishop of Nocera (498); but when he returned to Rome, his partizans stirred up constant strife until the Roman council of 501 deposed him.

Bibliography: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Mommsen, in *MGH*, *Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 120 sqq.; Bower, *Popes*, i. 296 sqq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 415 sqq.; and literature under Symmachus.

LAURENTIUS VALLA. See Valla.

LAVAL-MONTMORENCY, lā′vāl″-mōn″mō″-rān″sî′, **FRANÇOIS XAVIER DE:** First French bishop in Canada; b. at Montigny-sur-Avre, department of Eure-et-Loir, France, Apr. 30, 1623; d. in Quebec May 6, 1708. He received the tonsure at the age of nine, and a canonry of Evreux at fifteen. Renouncing his rights as heir to the ancient name and estates of his family, he pursued his ecclesiastical career, and was ordained priest in 1647 and made archdeacon of Evreux. In 1653 he was chosen as one of three French bishops to be sent to the Indies, and spent fifteen months in Rome awaiting consecration, but the opposition of the Portuguese government brought the plan to nothing. In 1659 he was sent to Canada as vicar-apostolic, with the title of bishop of Petræa *in partibus*, and from his first arrival there (with the exception of three visits to France to regulate the affairs of his mission and to obtain from the government humane treatment of the aborigines) was active until his death in pastoral and missionary labors. In 1663 he founded the Seminary of Quebec, to which the king assigned tithes that were to be used in supplying clergy for the whole province. The see of Quebec, the first diocesan bishopric in Canada, was founded in 1674, with jurisdiction over all the French possessions in North America. Worn out by his arduous tasks, which were made harder by conflicts with Frontenac and other secular authorities, he resigned his see into the hands of a younger man in 1684, but continued to make himself useful in the affairs of the seminary and the mission until his death. Laval University at Montreal, founded in 1852, was named in his honor. In 1878 his remains were transferred from the cathedral to the seminary; and in pursuance of the investigation connected with the process for his canonization, the coffin was opened in 1901, when his body was found in a perfect state of preservation.

Bibliography: H. J. Morgan, *Sketches of Celebrated Canadians and Persons Connected with Canada*, pp. 14 sqq., Montreal, 1865; H. Têtu, *Monseigneur de Laval, premier évêque de Québec*, Paris, 1887; A. Gosselin, *Le Vénérable François de Laval . . . : sa vie et ses vertus*, Quebec, 1890; A. Leblond de Brumath, *Bishop Laval*, Toronto, 1906.

Life.

LAVATER, lɑ-vā′ter, **JOHANN CASPAR:** Poet and theologian, perhaps best known as founder of the "art of physiognomy," was born at Zurich Nov. 15, 1741; d. there Jan. 2, 1801. He grew up in an atmosphere of good breeding and earnest piety and early displayed a decidedly religious nature. At the gymnasium in Zurich he had as his teachers Johann Jakob Bodmer and Johann Jakob Breitinger (q.v.), the ardent standard-bearers of a poetical art that had its wellsprings in refined sensibility. Bodmer entered into close personal relations with Lavater and awakened his enthusiasm for friendship and virtue, for free political ideals, and for the poetry of Klopstock and Young. His theological growth and thought were greatly influenced by Bishop Butler, Samuel Clarke, and their German devotees. In the spring of 1762 he was admitted to the ministerium of Zurich. The same year occurred his action against a certain district ruler, whom he accused before the council of oppression and fraud. A trip to Germany and a sojourn of nine months in the Pomeranian village Barth, where he studied with J. J. Spalding, removed him from the agitations which that legal action left in its train. On his return to Zurich in 1764 he busied himself in literary labors of a practical pastoral character. Under the title *Der Erinnerer* he issued an ethical weekly, which was largely a product of his own pen. Though yearning for the spiritual calling it was not till 1769 that he received his first appointment as assistant at the Orphan House Church, Zurich. He succeeded to the pastorate in 1775. In 1778 he was called as assistant at St. Peter's, Zurich; and in 1786 he was made pastor of this famous church and a member of the consistory.

Lavater assembled beneath his pulpit a large congregation every Sunday, attracted by his naturalness of delivery, by the direct and practical matter of his sermons, and by the spiritual affluence and personal conviction of the preacher. With his warm interest in every individual, his psychological delicacy of feeling, and his hearty love of man, he was a pastor quite unique. Not residents alone, but many strangers chose him as counselor for their inner life; and his pastoral correspondence grew to enormous proportions. He seldom left Zurich, but he frequently offered hospitality to old and new friends in his house. In the summer of 1774, at Bad Ems, he met Goethe, Basedow, and Jung Stilling; in 1786 he accompanied his son to Bremen; and in 1793 he acceded to an invitation of Count Bernstorff to visit Copenhagen. His closing years are interwoven with the great events which brought on the downfall of the ancient Swiss Confederacy. At the outset Lavater hailed the French Revolution as the dawn of popular freedom. Later, however, the "liberators'" deeds of violence filled him with indignation. An act of great boldness was his *Wort eines freien Schweizers an die französische Nation* (Eng., Fr., and Germ., London, 1798), a tract of arraignment that he sent on May 10, 1798, to the French director Reubell. There was no procedure against him immediately; but in the following year he was banished to Basel. He was at home again, when on Sept. 28, 1799, the French triumphed over the allies near Zurich. The French entered the city and a soldier asked Lavater for some wine; but hardly had he received it when he shot Lavater through the breast, and this wound ultimately caused his death. A few days after his departure each of his friends received a memorial verse that he had devised for them as a farewell greeting.

Religious Views.

Lavater's intercourse with German scholars confirmed in him a tendency to abstain from dogmatic forms of expression in religious matters. His own point of view was distinctly that of a mystic, though he held rigidly to the Bible. All illiberality and petty disputatiousness was repulsive to him. It was this that set him at odds with the Pietists and the Moravian school. From the observation, made in 1768, that in the New Testament the divine communications of power bear a sensibly supernatural stamp, and that nowhere in the New Testament is there mention of any ceasing of such sensible manifestations, Lavater inferred that perfect Christianity should still rest upon experiences of this kind. Thus, he acquired the habit of watching curiously and longingly for manifestations of supernatural divine powers. In the animal magnetism of Mesmer, in somnambulism, in Pastor Gassner's exorcisms, he was inclined to detect communications from the silent deity; and to the last he believed that the Apostle John still tarried on earth. His predilection for occult phenomena subjected him to considerable ridicule. However, Lavater recognized the danger of his enthusiastic proclivities and used discretion in the expression of his supernatural anticipations. Regarding Lavater's personality there was much discussion even in his lifetime. The unfriendly and unjust criticisms of Goethe, particularly in the *Xenien*, have dominated general opinion even to the present; but in other connections Goethe spoke quite differently of Lavater (cf. *Wahrheit und Dichtung*, III. 14). In practical life Lavater manifested deep piety, trust in God, and love toward man, and he fulfilled the duties of his calling with the greatest fidelity.

Writings.

Lavater was a voluminous author, and he invariably wrote with a view to "general usefulness." Nevertheless, with his tendency to emphasize practical effectiveness he combined the idealism common to the *Sturm und Drang* period, characterized by a tendency to contemplate and glorify the inner life. Lavater was a prominent exponent of this movement, though, in wealth of ideas and completeness of form, his contributions to the movement fall far behind those of Goethe, Herder, and others. At least three works deserve special mention here. In the case of the first the new style, for Lavater, arrayed itself in the mantle of Klopstock. A lady had besought him for a poem on the blessedness of the glorified. As the task grew upon him, he appealed by letters to his friends for counsel. The poem never took shape, but Lavater published his letters as *Aussichten in die Ewigkeit* (4 vols., Zurich, 1768–78), being speculations as to the conditions and powers of man after death. The guiding genius of Lavater's ideas here is not imaginative vision, in its proper sense, but psychological and ethical intuition; though these ideas are nevertheless expected to withstand the judgment of physiological and metaphysical science.

In *Physiognomische Fragmente* (4 parts, Leipsic, 1775–78; Eng. transl., *Essays on Physiognomy*, 3 vols., London, 1789–98), Lavater sought to portray the greatness of human nature under the wealth of individual characterizations. More independently than elsewhere with Lavater, the esthetic interest stands forth in this work—the esthetic in that higher sense, wherein form is the symbol of an inner content. At the same time, the physiognomic manner of contemplation was to have for its object the Creator's wisdom and his peculiar working in genial men, as the elect witnesses of his greatness. The ethical individualism that reached its most comprehensive expression in this work stands in fundamental accord with Goethe's mode of thought, as against the rationalistic ethics of the Enlightenment. In *Pontius Pilatus* (4 vols., Zurich, 1782–1785) Lavater gives a portraiture of humanity in the mirror of Christ's passion history. The author esteemed this work his most important; but Goethe took offense at the form and substance alike; and from that time these two spirits parted. It has even burdened more indulgent readers to find their way through this whirl of ideas; and yet in this work the author's fundamental thoughts, which he was fain to call his "system," might be supposed to appear most completely centered. Humanity, according to Lavater, lives in individualities, whose particular manifestation is consonant with the divine will, and who must mutually advance one another. Each one can "incite and enkindle the slumbering or inactive powers in his fellow"; can help him to become "livelier, freer, more positively existent, more enjoyable, and more surely discerning." Even God becomes enjoyable only through men. Uppermost on the ladder of humanity stands Christ, the "divine man" and the "manlike God." The infinite is enjoyable for us only in the finite; God humanizes himself in Christ. As touching the operations of Christ, Lavater loves the image of the physician and healing: forgiveness of sins is restoration of lost power. The fundamental thoughts of Christian belief thus appear reduced and adapted to the Gospel of the quickening, to the deification of humanity, as advocated by the youthful spirits of the sixties and seventies of the eighteenth century. With Hamann, Lavater is the Christian spirit of this circle.

Aside from Lavater's numerous collections of sermons and many devotional compilations, there are a number of other works deserving mention. The more important of these are: *Schweizerlieder* (Bern, 1767), a volume of patriotic songs with which Lavater achieved his greatest success as a poet; *Das geheime Tagebuch von einem Beobachter seiner selbst* (2 parts, Leipsic, 1771–73; Eng. transl., *Secret Journal of Self-observer*, 2 vols., London, 1795), the first of those sentimental disclosures whose more distinguished parallels occur in Goethe's *Werther* (1774) and Rousseau's *Confessions* (1781); *Abraham und Isaak* (Winterthur, 1776), a Biblical drama; *Jesus der Messias* (4 vols., 1783–86), a Biblical epic; *Nathanael* (1786), an apology for Christianity and the Bible; *Handbibliothek für Freunde* (24 vols., 1790–94); *Joseph von Arimathia* (Hamburg, 1794), another Biblical poem; and *Das menschliche Herz* (Zurich, 1798), a poem in six cantos. Lavater also wrote about seven hundred hymns, the best-known collection being *Christliche Lieder* (2 parts, Zurich, 1776–80). Of Lavater as a poet it may be said that, while he had great facility in metrical expression, he lacked creative power.

G. von Schulthess-Rechberg.

Bibliography: The life by his son-in-law, G. Gessner, 3 vols., Winterthur, 1802–03, is excellent as a source, but uncritical in its use of the material. The best life is by F. Muncker, Stuttgart, 1883 (those by F. I. Herbst, Ansbach, 1832, and F. W. Bodemann, Gotha, 1877, are closely dependent upon Gessner). Consult further: J. C. Mörikofer, *Die schweizerische Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Leipsic, 1861; H. Funck, *Lavater und der Markgraf Karl Friedrich von Baden*, Freiburg, 1890; idem, *Goethe und Lavater. Briefe und Tagebücher*, Weimar, 1901; G. A.

Müller, *Aus Lavaters Brieftasche*, Munich, 1897; J. C. Finsler, *Lavaters Beziehungen zu Paris . . . 1789–95*, Zurich, 1898; *Johann Kaspar Lavater, 1741–1801*, ib. 1902 (a memorial on the centennial of Lavater's death). There is a *Life* in English, London, 1849.

LAVIGERIE, lā″vî″zhe-rî′, **CHARLES MARTIAL ALLEMAND:** French prelate, cardinal, and promoter of African missions; b. at Bayonne Oct. 31, 1825; d. at Algiers Nov. 26, 1892. He was educated for the priesthood at the seminaries of St. Nicholas and St. Sulpice and at the École des Carmes. In the last-named, after his ordination in 1849, he taught Latin literature, and was adjunct professor of theology at the Sorbonne 1854–1856. He was then appointed director of the French Christian schools in the East, and in Syria came for the first time into contact with the non-Christian world, recognizing then his missionary vocation. In 1861 he returned to Europe, and was named auditor of the Rota at Rome and two years later bishop of Nancy. By the influence of Marshal MacMahon, then governor of Algeria, he received the offer of the bishopric of Algiers in 1866, and accepted it in preference to the coadjutor-archbishopric of Paris which was offered him at the same time. His new see had just been raised to the rank of an archbishopric. He took possession of it in Mar., 1867, and at once plunged into missionary plans. In the next year he organized the "Society of Algerian Missionaries" (though it did not receive its final constitution until 1874), and in 1868 the Propaganda gave him the oversight of the prefecture apostolic of the Sahara. His "White Fathers," as the members of his society were commonly called from their habit, penetrated the interior, and in 1875 and 1878 some of them attempted to reach Timbuctu at the cost of their lives. In 1878 the whole of equatorial Africa was placed under their charge. From that year Lavigerie was prominent in antislavery agitation, and it was by his efforts that the great congress on that subject assembled in Paris in 1890. He was made a cardinal in 1882. His work in Tunis led to the reestablishment of the ancient see of Cyprian at Carthage in 1884, and from Jan. 25, 1885, he bore the title of archbishop of Carthage and primate of Africa. The policy of toleration of the French Republic adopted by Leo XIII. was first enunciated by him at a dinner which he gave to the officers of the Mediterranean squadron in Nov., 1890, and was confirmed by a papal brief of the following February. A selection of his works, consisting principally of letters and allocutions (2 vols.) was published in Paris, 1884.

Bibliography: A. C. Grussenmayer, *Vingt-cinq années d'épiscopat en France et en Afrique*, 2 vols., Algiers, 1886; R. F. Clarke, *Cardinal Lavigerie and the African Slave Trade*, London, 1889; F. Klein, *Le Cardinal Lavigerie et les missions d'Afrique*, Paris, 1890; idem, *Le Cardinal Lavigerie et ses œuvres d'Afrique*, ib. 1897; E. Lesur and J. A. Petit, *Hist. populaire de . . . le cardinal Charles-Martial-Allemand Lavigerie*, ib., 1892; A. Perraud, *Le Cardinal Lavigerie*, ib., 1893; F. Bournand, *Son Eminence le Cardinal Lavigerie*, ib. 1893; A. Ricard, *Le Cardinal Lavigerie*, Lille, 1893; X. de Préville, *Un grand français, le cardinal Lavigerie*, ib., 1894; L. Baunard, *Le Cardinal Lavigerie*, 2 vols., Paris, 1896; J. Simon, *Quatre portraits*, ib., 1896; L. d'Annam, *Le Grand Apôtre de l'Afrique*, Lyons, 1899.

LAW AND GOSPEL.

The Judaic and Pauline Conceptions (§ 1).
The Conception of Jesus (§ 2).
The Writings of John (§ 3).
Early and Medieval Church (§ 4).
Luther (§ 5).

1. The Judaic and Pauline Conceptions.

The history of these two conceptions is the history of the general conception of Christianity, because Christianity as a whole is based upon two corresponding categories which form the standard of the religion of redemption—that of the obligatory demand which human activity is to fulfil, and that of the saving grace which God bestows. Judaism teaches that only he whom God declares justified upon the basis of the fulfilment of the law of Moses partakes of the promised salvation to be revealed in the Gospel. Apart from the ritualism and national particularism of the Jews, this theory is defective in so far as the relation between God and man is considered, after the analogy of civil law, as one of human service and a divine equivalent for it, from which follow irreligious self-dependence, heteronomy, and hedonistic motives of morality. For Paul both law and Gospel are revelations of God concerning the way to eternal life, which to him is of a spiritual nature, a life of justice, love, and sanctity. The law, however, does not lead to eternal life, not only because it consists merely of ritual provisions, but also in so far as it demands virtues like justice, love, and sanctity. Just because it merely demands, it can not accomplish its aim over against the flesh; it even increases the lust of the flesh and incites transgression. But, apart from the flesh, the law can not give life, because it induces man to secure his justification before God as a legal claim of reward. Therefore it is not a permanent, but only a transitory, order of God. It was to awaken knowledge of sin and thus prepare the way for the permanent divine order, namely that of the Gospel, an order of grace which pardons and gives gratuitously and demands nothing more than faith, which gives God his honor by humbly renouncing the assertion of one's own will and trusting in God's grace and omnipotence. What the new order signifies may best be seen from the standpoint of faith. On the basis of the assurance of God's intention of grace in Christ, the believer knows himself to be justified and adopted by God and reconciled with him. He has the assurance that he will escape the wrath of judgment, inherit eternal life, and finally be endowed with perfection. The consciousness of his freedom from the law leads him to the consciousness of the duty to concentrate his will upon the struggle against the lusts of the flesh and the earnest endeavor to fulfil the will of God and the moral conditions of eternal life. Paul does not consider Christians as freed from the need of moral instruction and he expects Christian tact only as a result of the Christian's self-examination and self-education. But herein he does not fall back upon the standpoint of the law, because the reasons on which he bases his individual rules of life exclude the heteronomy of ritualistic norms, and also all hedonistic motives.

Thus the permanent part in the law is its content, in so far as it corresponds to our conception of salvation and as the Gospel realizes it, while its legal form is only a temporary means. Since this was only the final result of Paul's reflections, it was possible for him to concede previously to the legal form that it must be satisfied by the death of Christ before the order of grace can become efficacious.

2. The Conception of Jesus.

Jesus had a different conception of law and Gospel. Not only does he use the terms differently, in so far as "the Gospel" was for him the message of the nearness of the kingdom of God, understood in eschatological sense, and in so far as he subjected his disciples to "the law," not dissolving it, but advocating its fulfilment to its fullest extent, but also there is an essential difference, in so far as Jesus, instead of starting from the experience of the present redemption from guilt and the power of sin, appealed to the will by means of fear and hope so that justification of life might be brought about, and in so far as he, instead of deriving all salvation from his own person and will, placed both behind what men are to do and what God will do. But in the innermost essence, there is no real difference between Paul and Jesus. The seeming contrast is to be explained from the fact that the sermon of Jesus is a means of the educating and hence redeeming activity of the bearer of revelation, while Paul speaks out of the consciousness of the redeemed. Jesus filled the traditional formula "through fulfilment of the law to reward" with a new content—the same which Paul advocated. This is manifest from the most peculiar thought of Jesus, that of Adoption (q.v.). Without infringing upon the ritualistic commands of the law, he asserted, as that which pleases God, only that attitude of the heart which manifests itself in childlike trust in God, and in imitation of God's disposition in the love of our fellow men. He excluded the legal conception of our relation to God by demanding an unassuming childlike spirit and calling the reward a superabundant reward of grace. Thus he changed the demand; but adoption was for him more than an obligatory demand. For himself, his life and activity were the reflex of the love of God as he had experienced it in his heart, however much in individual cases obedience conformable to duty was not strange to him. But as he disclosed his knowledge of the Father to his disciples and assured them of God's forgiveness and care, and as the impression of his unity with God gave emphasis to his work, his admonition to trust in the Father and become similar to God grew powerful in such a way that it raised it into the life of adoption which will be perfected in the coming kingdom of God. Therefore those who have heeded his admonition become, first of all, certain of the fact that they have been saved.

3. The Writings of John.

Under the presupposition of the consciousness of salvation, the writings of John place the self-activity to be expected of the regenerated, especially that of love, under the view-point of a new commandment, whose fulfilment is the condition for the continuance and perfection of the new life. This does not mean the reestablishment of law; for the experience of the love of God is the motive of the fulfilment of the commandment. The new law in the sense of John is not a sum of commandments as they are given to servants, but a disclosure of the entire and uniform will of God as it is made to friends of Christ. Its fulfilment is immediate life and blessedness. Moreover, the consciousness of duty toward God's commandment is overshadowed by the consciousness of dependence upon the preserving, purifying, and perfecting activity of God.

4. Early and Medieval Church.

In the early Church Christianity was at first understood as new law in the Judaistic sense, in so far as free persons have to acquire the eternal reward by their own fulfilment of moral demands, and grace is limited to knowledge of God and forgiveness of sin in baptism. This was not altered when Irenæus disclosed Christ again as the Redeemer, because redemption in his sense is only physical; or when the institution of penance mediated forgiveness of sins also after baptism, because this relates only to particular sins and does not give an individual certainty of the state of grace. The Roman spirit even intensified the legal conception, since the relation to God was considered after the manner of civil law, and there was not only demanded that the Christian should earn for himself the reward of God, but should give him satisfaction also for sins by voluntary painful works. Augustine renewed the doctrine of Paul concerning law and Gospel, law of works and law of faith; both aim at the realization of love to God as the highest good, but are opposed to each other in so far as this love is only demanded by the law, while it is actually given as a blessing in the Gospel. "By the law of works God says to us, 'do what I command thee'; but by the law of faith we say to God, 'give me what thou commandest'" (*De spiritu et littera*, xxii., *NPNF*, 1st ser., v. 92). They are related to each other in so far as the law, by inciting lust, shows that the motive of its fulfilment is not love to God, but "the fear of punishment" and "the love of gain," and thus compels us to seek faith, which as hope and prayer takes refuge in God's mercy. But his mercy infuses love of him or of righteousness into the soul of the believer, by means of which the will after its cure fulfils the law without the law, and desires no other reward but progress and perfection, being conscious that the fulfilment is due to the grace of God. But Augustine does not come up to the standard of Paul since he knows grace only as a secret power and has not attained an absolute certainty of salvation. Moreover, he combined with Paulinism the common view of Catholicism concerning the law, by repeatedly estimating the achievements due to grace as merits and satisfactions. In the Middle Ages this combination of Augustine remained as basis, but by enlarging the conception of merit and applying it to actions which are possible without grace and necessary for its preparation, and by deriving all hope of salvation by means of the uncertain deduction from natural secret effects of grace, the law practically gained the upper hand.

5. Luther. Luther put law and Gospel into the strongest opposition. The law demands and frightens, the Gospel bestows and consoles; but they belong together and exhaust the whole content of Scripture. In order to understand this, we must distinguish in the law content and form. Its content is the unchangeable will of God; without its fulfilment there is no salvation; but it is not to be fulfilled merely as a condition of salvation, but in the spirit of "a loving delight in the law," contrasted with the common pleasure-seeking piety. Thus Luther advanced a step beyond Augustine and the mystics, since with them hope preponderates, while for him eternal life begins here on earth in reconciliation with the law; and since their love of God is a retired, holy indifference, while his love of God manifests itself in a trust in God which is elevated above sins and death and governs the world and manifests itself in the love of our fellow men. According to its form, the law brings man before the "throne of judgment." It is a demand and threat of punishment against a contradicting will. In this respect it is only temporary; for the thought that the favor of God might be earned is not only impossible in consideration of original sin, but "a dream which is false in itself," a robbery of the honor of God, idolatry; God is not a "huckster," it is his nature to give everything gratuitously. It is true, the content of the law as humble trust in God and inclination toward good conduct contradicts the form of the law as a rule of retribution, but in this very form it is a means of God to accomplish his purposes. On the one side, it guards against external transgressions and upholds public peace; on the other side, by disclosing and magnifying our spiritual transgressions it destroys our self-sufficiency and awakens a feeling of guilt and longing after forgiving grace. After this has been accomplished, the Gospel steps in—by assuring us of forgiving grace, it awakens love to God which gladly fulfils the law and thus experiences salvation already in this life. The Gospel has three characteristic traits. It is promise or attestation of the divine will of grace to the consciousness, it is promise of the forgiveness of sins, it is promise of the forgiveness vouchsafed in Christ for the awakened conscience. It is the active cause of faith which supports conscience without blunting it. With this faith the whole redemption is realized in principle; for it is the moving power for the fulfilment of the law. By extending over the whole life, it is the fulfilment of the first commandment, and by becoming a prayer of thankfulness and supplication, that of the second; and the desire to pass on our blessings to others produces in us an inclination to love our fellow men, and by paralyzing the attraction of worldly goods and evils by means of trust in God it gives the power to realize this inclination. But all these abilities Luther traces back also to a second gift beside forgiveness, namely, the Holy Spirit. As the unchangeable will of God, the law is also the measure for the manner of the realization of the order of grace. In this respect, the inviolability of the divine will as expressed in the law must be fully satisfied. This is the case in so far as the forgiveness of sins in the penitent is the very means of realizing its content. But Luther postulated also the satisfaction of the law by the vicarious satisfaction of Christ, in contradiction to his statement that the law has only a pedagogical import. The fulfilment of the law is to take place in a natural manner, without reflection on the law, just as the good tree brings forth its fruits. The good must spring from a good disposition; but by this comparison Luther places himself in contradiction, not only to Christ and John, but also to Paul, since it excludes reflection on every objective norm and the motivation of good-will by the thought of the aim of eternal life. But since for Luther the new life of the Christian is still in a state of growth and maintains itself only by continual struggle with the remnants of sin, he teaches that the Christian still needs education through the objective law. As he can think, however, of an objective order of the law only in the legal norm of right which threatens punishment, instruction and admonition by the law appear to him as something that is in contradiction to the spiritual condition of the new man; and thus Luther makes Christian life dualistic, instead of showing how it stands under a moral law without losing the character of its freedom. (J. Gottschick†.)

Bibliography: The literature on §§ 1–3 is given under Biblical Theology; that on § 4 under Doctrines, History of. On § 5 consult: J. Köstlin, *Luthers Theologie*, Stuttgart, 1863; T. Harnack, *Luthers Theologie*, i. 475–480, Erlangen, 1862; S. Lommatzsch, *Luthers Lehre*, Berlin, 1879; E. Tröltsch, *Vernunft und Offenbarung bei J. Gerhard und Melanchthon*, pp. 127–143, Göttingen, 1891. On the general problem: S. H. Tyng, *Lectures on the Law and the Gospel*, New York, 1848; J. M. Armour, *Atonement and Law*, London, 1885. Consult also Atonement.

LAW, HEBREW, CIVIL AND CRIMINAL.

I. Origins and Development.
  Semitic Background (§ 1).
  Effects of Settlement in Canaan (§ 2).
  The Hebrew Codes (§ 3).
II. Administration of the Law.
  The Judges (§ 1).
  The Procedure (§ 2).
III. Criminal Law.
  Development from Lex Talionis (§ 1).
  Capital Offenses (§ 2).
IV. Rights of Persons.
V. Rights of Property.
  Real Estate (§ 1).
  Debt (§ 2).
  Injury to Property (§ 3).
VI. Inheritance.

I. Origins and Development: **1. Semitic Background.** According to the ancients, law and justice came from God. The Babylonian King Hammurabi received his mandates from the hand of the sun-god Shamash, while Yahweh gave the tables of the law to Moses on Sinai. Throughout their history Yahweh was the source of law for the Israelites, his precepts (*toroth*) being communicated to them by his servants, the priests. Matters of little importance were not referred to him, but where the wisdom of man was insufficient, or where no fixed law had yet been established, the decision of the divinity was sought through the priests. This ruling was then regarded as a norm in similar cases and thus became law, deriving its authority from the fact that it was the will of God. This sanction gained additional force in Israel, since there Yahweh was regarded as a God who watched over righteousness and justice and hated iniquity. When the Israelites first emerged into the light of history, they possessed neither a firm political organization nor law. Instead of written law tribal custom prevailed, and in place of an executive magistracy stood the tribal deity, whose will was represented by the customs of the tribe. It might, then, be supposed that each tribe would create its own custom, without regard to its neighbors, but it must not be forgotten that since the dawn of history Arabia and the Syro-Arabian desert had been under the influence of Babylonian civilization, and that in Babylonia as early as 2200 B.C. law had reached a height in the Code of Hammurabi (q.v.) which was not equaled even in the Hebrew Book of the Covenant in the late regal period. Contact with ancient Arabian culture, which attained a noteworthy eminence among the Minaeans in the second half of the second millennium B.C., is confirmed by the Israelitic narrative itself when it states that Moses modeled his code according to the counsel of the Midianite Jethro.

2. Effects of Settlement in Canaan.

The settlement in the West Jordan country was a momentous epoch in the development of law. In its content law must have been widely extended, since new conditions brought new legal problems; but the independent development of Israelitic law had not yet begun. Since the discovery of the Code of Hammurabi, it may be regarded as certain that the Canaanites among whom the Hebrews had come and whose culture they adopted had a highly systematized code. This Canaanite system was deeply influenced by Babylonia, and this explains why Israelitic law, even after being taken from the Canaanites and worked over in the Book of the Covenant, shows so close an affinity with the Code of Hammurabi. This agreement is seldom verbal, but the spirit and the basal concepts, except in religion, are essentially the same, although the Babylonian code deals with a far more highly developed and more coherent political organization. The entire system of legal procedure was transformed by the new home of the Israelites. Nomadic Bedouins have no judges clothed with executive authority, but fixed abodes change clans and families to local communities and territorial unions. The heads of the communities, or elders, become the magistracy, and behind their enactment stands the power of the community. Thus a form of public law was evolved, and the community assumed control of the protection of individual rights.

3. The Hebrew Codes.

The rise of the Israelitic kingdom resulted in a definite system of law and in legal uniformity, in so far as this had not already been achieved. The date of the codification of the unwritten law is unknown. It may have taken place at an early date at the sanctuaries, but the most primitive document known is the so-called Book of the Covenant (Ex. xx. 24–xxiii. 19). The Book of the Covenant does not pronounce great principles of law or abstract legal doctrines to be applied in individual cases at the discretion of the judge, but it is a collection of special instances and is restricted to the problems of daily life. It deals with the status of slaves, with injuries to life or limb, and with injuries to property, whether daughter or slave, cattle or fruit. There is as yet no commercial law, while the Code of Hammurabi is highly developed in this respect. The Book of the Covenant was evidently a compilation of existing customary law, and it is nowhere stated that it ever received sanction as official, nor is it known who compiled the collection or who caused it to be made. It was possibly not official, but may have been drawn up by private persons, or, in other words, by the priests. Far different is Deuteronomy, which was officially proclaimed as the law of the State in the eighteenth year of Josiah (621 B.C.). Though similar to the Book of the Covenant in form and content, it marks an important step in advance in that it seeks to bring all civil and religious law within the scope of the point of view of the theocracy. The characteristic of this code is its humanitarianism in providing for the poor, for servants, for widows, and for orphans. The Priestly Code was introduced as the law of the State after the exile (Neh. viii.–x.). Taken as a whole, it contains only religious law, although it also considers individual questions of civil life in so far as they concern the hierocracy of the priestly code. In it is incorporated the independent " Law of Holiness " (Lev. xvii.–xxvi.), which proceeds from the point of view of the sanctity of the people. The written law, as extant, concerns only a small portion of civil life; unfortunately no other codification of customary law has been preserved. The Torah became the infallible basis for all further development of the law, its deficiencies being supplied by casuistic interpretation or by a codification of the law of custom. The law thus deduced was termed *Halakhah*, and with its recognition the scholars of the law became the actual legislators. The results of their activity are summed up in the Mishnah (see TALMUD), which is based on an earlier work dating from the time of Rabbi Akiba ben Joseph, who flourished between 110 and 135 A.D., under whose direction the Halakhah, which had been transmitted orally, seems to have been codified.

1. The Judges.

II. Administration of the Law: Legal jurisdiction was originally lodged in the family (Gen. xxviii. 24; Deut. xii. 18 sqq.), or in the " elders," or heads of the clans and tribes (Ex. xviii. 13 sqq.; Num. xi. 16 sqq.; Deut. i. 13 sqq.). Parallel with this was the decision of the priest as the servant of God, while Moses, according to the narrative, laid the most difficult problems before God (Ex. xviii. 15, 19). The judicial power of the elders was only moral; they possessed no executive authority and with the settlement in Palestine were superseded by the heads of the local communities, who acquired executive power, since a permanent community naturally had an interest in the maintenance of the law. This court of elders retained its judicial authority in the regal period (II Sam. xiv. 4 sqq.; I Kings xxi. 8 sqq.), while Deuteronomy recognizes them as an organized body with full judicial powers (Deut. xix. 12, xxi. 2 sqq., xxii. 15, etc.), and as the representatives of the community (Deut. xvii. 7). It must accordingly be assumed that though the Book of the Covenant does not state it, its "judges" were the elders. The priests retained their judicial power at all times. In the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xxii. 9, R.V.) the decision of God is sought at the sanctuary in cases of unusual difficulty, while in Deuteronomy the Levites constitute an ecclesiastical court which decides also secular matters. The tendency of Deuteronomy is to enlarge their jurisdiction, and to leave the elders the right of punishment only in those derelictions which directly concern the family (Deut. xxi. 1 sqq., 18 sqq., xxii. 13 sqq., xxv. 7 sqq.). At that period the king was the chief judge (II Sam. xiv. 4 sqq.), although his ruling might be sought at the very first, especially in difficult cases (II Sam. xv. 2 sqq.; I Kings iii. 16 sqq.; II Kings xv. 5). This right of the king was then transferred to his officials, who judged in the king's name. Unfortunately it is not known whether or how the authority of the royal officials was conditioned by the elders and priests. The Chronicler ascribes to Jehoshaphat the creation of a supreme court in Jerusalem and the appointment of judges in the individual cities (II Chron. xix. 4–11), but it is impossible to assume that the high priest and the "prince of Judah" were the spiritual and secular presidents of this court, although it would agree with the statement of the Chronicler that David had given 6,000 Levites the office of judge (I Chron. xxiii. 4, xxvi. 29). The local judges in the time of Ezra were chosen from among the elders of the city (Ezra vii. 25, x. 14). In the Greek and Roman period such judges were found everywhere (Judith vi. 16; Josephus, *Wars*, II., xiv. 1; cf. Matt. v. 22, x. 17; Mark xiii. 9). In small towns the council of elders exercised judicial functions (Luke vii. 3), while larger places seem to have contained special courts. In later times local courts usually had seven members, and twenty in larger cities.

2. The Procedure.

Judicial procedure was oral, although the later period seems to have known written complaints (Job xxxi. 35 sqq.). The judges sat at the city-gate (Deut. xxi. 19, xxii. 15; Amos v. 12, 15), while Solomon built a "porch of judgment" at Jerusalem (I Kings vii. 7). The plaintiff lodged his own complaint; if he failed to do so, no one else brought the matter to the attention of the court, for there was no prosecuting attorney. Proof was by witnesses, the law requiring the concordant testimony of two witnesses, especially in cases involving capital punishment (Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 15; Num. xxxv. 30; for an exception cf. Deut. xxi. 18 sqq.). According to the Talmud (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* IV., viii. 15) adult freemen alone were eligible as witnesses, slaves and women being excluded; according to Lev. v. 1, compulsory testimony was common. False witness was punished by the *lex talionis* (Deut. xix. 18 sqq.). In cases where witnesses could not be found, an oath was required (Ex. xxii. 6–11), and in the older period the Ordeal (q.v.) was frequently invoked as a means of proof (Ex. xxii. 8; I Sam. xiv. 41; Joshua vii. 14), although later this was restricted to the single case of the charge of adultery (Num. v.). Torture was first employed as a means of obtaining testimony during the Herodian rule (Josephus, *Wars*, I., xxx. 2–5).

III. Criminal Law: In the Code of Hammurabi criminal law is under the absolute control of the State, while in the Old Testament it is still in process of development from private to public law.

1. Development from the Lex Talionis.

Private law belongs primarily to the *lex talionis* ("Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, . . . wound for wound," Ex. xxi. 24–25). This principle dominated even public law, as is shown by the Code of Hammurabi, although it was originally the norm for private revenge. The man who had been injured had the right to do to his injurer the same harm as had been done him; among savage peoples revenge is regarded as a righteous and holy sentiment. This appears most clearly in the case of murder, where revenge was not merely justified but sanctified, and was a kinsman's duty. Absolute *lex talionis*, as is clear from Blood Revenge (q.v.), makes all controversies eternal, and it therefore marks a long step in advance when the Israelites at an early period substituted in certain cases the wergild for blood-revenge. Such compensation could not escape regulation by general custom, and ancient Israelitic usage required such settlement in personal injuries (Ex. xxi. 18), but paralleled it with blood-revenge, except in the case of manslaughter (Ex. xxi. 30). A third stage is public criminal law, in which society deprives the individual of the right of punishment, which is then executed by the authorities. Revenge thus becomes punishment, which is regulated by the interests of the whole community. Punishment has, moreover, a religious end. Sin, especially murder, brought on the land a defilement which was purged by punishment (cf. II Sam. xxi., xxiv.; Num. xxxv. 33; Deut. xix. 19). This assumption of guilt by the State involved a family in the punishment of its members, and in aggravated cases children suffered with their fathers (Joshua vii. 24; II Kings ix. 26; cf. also the general principle that Yahweh visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children). The concept of blood-revenge is still retained, and if the avengers are unable to seize the murderer, his family is slain instead (cf. II Sam. xxi. 6 sqq.), a principle found both in the Code of Hammurabi and in modern custom among the Bedouins, which was not abrogated among the Israelites before Deuteronomy (Deut. xxiv. 16). Punishment by retaliation occurs only in case of bodily injury, and substitutional punishment, frequent in the Code of Hammurabi, is mentioned but once (Deut. xxv. 12). The death-penalty was by stoning (Lev. xxiv. 14; Deut. xvii. 5), since such cases as those described in II Sam. i. 15 and II Kings x. 7, 25 were not the execution of a punishment ordered by the court. In certain instances the penalty was increased by burning or hanging the corpse, thus depriving the criminal of the benefit of burial (Lev. xx. 14, xxi. 9), although Deuteronomy (xxi. 22) mitigated this portion of the punishment. Crucifixion and strangulation (the latter, according to the Talmud, the usual form of punishment) were introduced by the Romans. Burning to death seems to have been practised in the earliest period (Gen. xxxviii. 24) but in later times it was restricted to gross immorality (Lev. xx. 14, xxi. 9), while the Code of Hammurabi enacts it as the penalty for incest. Punishment by beating is first mentioned in Deut. xxv. 1–3, but the crimes for which it was inflicted are taken for granted, although the maximum number of blows is fixed at forty (later forty less one; cf. II Cor. xi. 24; Josephus, *Ant.*, IV., viii. 21, 23). Imprisonment is first mentioned in the post-exilic period (Ezra vii. 26), but dungeons, stocks, and iron collars were frequently employed by the kings (Jer. xx. 2, xxix. 26 sqq.; II Chron. xviii. 25). In all other cases, as in the Code of Hammurabi, fines alone were exacted, and were regarded as a recompense for plaintiffs rather than as punishments. The sense of liability is well developed, as it is in the Code of Hammurabi. A careful distinction is drawn in the Book of the Covenant between murder and manslaughter (Ex. xxi. 12 sqq.), and the right of self-defense is recognized (Ex. xxii. 2), while accidental injuries are distinguished from intentional.

2. Capital Offenses.

In their details the punitive regulations which have been preserved are very incomplete. According to the ancient view, death alone could atone for murder (Gen. ix. 5–6), and the later law was thus obliged to recognize the right of blood-revenge (Deut. xix. 1–13; Num. xxxv. 16–21), although the tendency to transform this into punishment inflicted by the authorities was early manifested (II Sam. xiv. 4 sqq.). The factor here at work was the distinction between murder and manslaughter. In Deuteronomy (xix. 1–13) previous hatred is considered a proof of the intentional character of the deed, and in the Priestly Code the use of a deadly weapon bears with it the same implication (Num. xxxv. 16 sqq.). Murder was punished with death (Num. xxxv. 31), yet the murderer had the right of asylum at a sanctuary (Ex. xxi. 14), or, in later times, at special cities of refuge (Deut. xix. 2–3; Num. xxxv. 11 sqq.). There it was to be decided whether the fugitive was guilty of murder or manslaughter. In the former case he was to be driven from his asylum (Ex. xxi. 14; Deut. xix. 11 sqq.; Num. xxxv. 11 sqq.); in the latter eventuality the guilty man was free within the city, although he could not obtain full amnesty until the death of the high priest (Num. xxxv. 25; post-exilic). In case of malice, the *lex talionis* was employed, but in injuries inflicted in the heat of quarrel the defendant had only to pay the expenses for the healing of the plaintiff, and recompense him for the time of his illness (for another case of fine, cf. Ex. xxi. 22). Among offenses against morality, incest, pederasty, and bestiality were punished with death (Lev. xx. 10 sqq.; Ex. xxii. 18), and the same penalty was inflicted on both parties guilty of adultery, except that, when force had been used, the woman was acquitted (Deut. xxii. 25–26), the law agreeing herein with the Code of Hammurabi. The seduction of an unbetrothed girl was regarded as an injury to property (Ex. xxii. 15; Deut. xxii. 28–29), although the daughter of a priest was punished with death (Lev. xxi. 9). A significant trait of Hebrew law is the fact that it, in antithesis to the Code of Hammurabi, comprised crimes against religion under civil law, punishing not only idolatry and witchcraft (Ex. xxii. 18, 20) with death, but even, in Deuteronomy (xiii. 6–18), any temptation to these crimes, while the Priestly Code was still more severe (Lev. xxiv. 16).

IV. Rights of Persons: Full rights were enjoyed only by adult freemen who were capable of bearing arms. Lists of the citizens seem to have been prepared at an early period (Ex. xxxii. 32), and are frequently mentioned in later times (e.g., Isa. x. 19). In Num. i. 3 and Lev. xxvii. 3 the age of twenty is taken to be that at which arms may first be borne, and it may be assumed that this rule held good at an earlier period. The legal freedom of women, on the other hand, was limited.

V. Rights of Property: The regulations coming under this category are concerned with purchase, debt, and indemnity. The purchase and sale of movable property, as well as many other commercial matters regulated in the Code of Hammurabi, were not controlled by Hebrew law.

1. Real Estate.

Preexilic Israel was not a commercial people. In the sale of real estate, custom laid restrictions on the owner. The ground in which father and grandfather were buried (I Kings xxi. 3) was sacred to the son and grandson, and the law sought to keep the property in the family, giving those kinsmen who had the right of inheritance the privilege of preemption and redemption (Jer. xxxii. 8 sqq.). The Priestly Code enacted the right of redemption of real estate to be exercised within a year (Lev. xxv. 25 sqq.). The antiquity of this custom is unknown, but it is a mere theory that every fifty years purchased property was restored to its original owners without compensation (Lev. xxv. 13 sqq.). Certain formalities were customary in purchase. Witnesses were summoned (Gen. xxiii. 7–20), and in the time of Jeremiah it was usual to draw up a deed (Jer. xxxii. 6 sqq., 44). An ancient symbolic act in the transfer of real estate was the giving of a shoe to the purchaser by the seller in token of his renunciation of the property, a ceremony no longer clear in origin (Ruth iv. 7; cf. Ps. lx. 8; Deut. xxv. 9, xi. 24?).

2. Debt.

Debt receives less detailed treatment than in the Code of Hammurabi. Debts exist, even according to the view of Deuteronomy, only because the poor exist; the Old Testament knows nothing of a system of credit in connection with trade. The tendency of the laws, therefore, was to protect the debtor against oppression. Usury was accordingly forbidden, but unfortunately there is no statement respecting a just rate of interest (Ex. xxii. 25). In ancient Babylonia interest ran as high as forty per cent. and averaged twenty per cent. In the Israelitic code the creditor received a pledge, but could retain an upper garment, the covering of the poor, only until sundown (Ex. xxii. 26). Deuteronomy went still further, and prohibited the taking in pledge of any article necessary for livelihood (Deut. xxiv. 6, 13, 17, xxx., xxiv. 10–11, and Code of Hammurabi, 241). In a like spirit interest was absolutely forbidden (Deut. xxiii. 19–20; cf. Ezek. xviii. 16–17), at least so far as compatriots were concerned. In the case of insolvent debtors, as in Babylonian law (cf. Code of Hammurabi, 54), the levy seems to have included the person, but though the creditor could not deprive the debtor of his property, he was permitted, as in the Code of Hammurabi (116, 117), to sell the debtor into slavery together with his family and property (II Kings iv. 1; Neh. v. 5, 8; Isa. l. 1; Jer. xxxiv. 8 sqq.), although this servitude ended after the lapse of six years (Ex. xxi. 2; cf. Code of Hammurabi, 117, which enacts that a wife and her children shall work only three years; on the bondage of the daughter, cf. especially Ex. xxi. 7 sqq.). In Deuteronomy this law becomes a command to remit all debt in the seventh year (Deut. xv. 1 sqq.), although with little success (Deut. xv. 9 sqq.; Ezek. xvii. 7 sqq.; Jer. xxxiv. 8 sqq.). To Rabbi Hillel was ascribed the device of the *prosbul*, a declaration before the court that the creditor reserved the right to demand payment of the debt at any time without regard to the year of release. In the Priest Code the manumission was required to take place in the year of jubilee, but kindly treatment of the enslaved debtor was enjoined (Lev. xxv. 35 sqq.; cf. Code of Hammurabi, 115–116).

3. Injury to Property.

Indemnity for injury to property could be exacted only where guilt was proved, as in theft and embezzlement, wherein the Hebrew law was more lenient than the Code of Hammurabi, which here frequently imposed the death penalty. The restitution for theft was to be double the amount of money (comp. Code of Hammurabi, 120, 124, 126), four times the number of sheep, and five times the number of oxen (Ex. xxii. 1–3). Guilt was also evidenced by gross carelessness (Ex. xxi. 29–36, xxii. 5, 12). If a man's guilt was proved and he was unable to make restitution, he was sold into slavery as a debtor, but where there was no evidence of guilt, there was no compensation (Ex. xxii. 7–8, 10–11, 13). Deuteronomy contains no details on these subjects, but the Priest Code is occasionally milder, enacting that one who concealed anything entrusted to him, or anything stolen or found, make complete restoration and add one-fifth of the value as a fine (Lev. vi. 20–24).

VI. Inheritance: The law of inheritance was agnatic throughout. Unlike the Code of Hammurabi (172), Hebrew law denied the inheritance to the wife, since she formed part of the heritable estate of her husband. Daughters likewise were incapable of inheritance, this being another point of divergence from the Code of Hammurabi (180, 183, 184). Lack of male offspring gave the inheritance to the nearest agnate, who also had the duty of blood-revenge. The sons of different wives had equal right of inheritance, although the first-born son received a double portion (Deut. xxi. 17). The father might, however, favor one son rather than another, and might even transfer the inheritance of the first-born to a younger son, as to the first son of a favorite wife, although this was contrary to custom and was forbidden by Deuteronomy (Gen. xlix. 3, xxi. 1 sqq.; I Kings i. 11–13; Deut. xxi. 15–17). It is unknown whether the real estate was divided, nor is it certain whether the inheritance of the sons by a concubine (Gen. xxi. 11) was equal to that of the sons by a wife, although much seems to have depended on the good-will of the father. It was not until the later period that the law allowed daughters to inherit in case there were no sons (Num. xxvii. 4 sqq.), although in such instances they were obliged to marry a husband from their father's stock (Num. xxxvi. 1–12), in order that the estate might not pass to an unrelated family. It was an exceptional act of favor to allow daughters to inherit together with sons (Job xlii. 15), but even in case of a childless marriage the wife had no right of inheritance, the heirs then being the kinsmen of her husband.

I. Benzinger.

Bibliography: J. Klein, *Das Gesetz über das gerichtliche Beweisverfahren nach mosaisch-talmudischem Recht*, Halle, 1885; J. D. Michaelis, *Mosaisches Recht*, 6 vols., Frankfort, 1775; Frenkel, *Der gerichtliche Beweis*, Berlin, 1846; J. L. Saalschutz, *Das mosaische Recht*, ib. 1853; L. Diestel, *Die religiösen Delikte im israelitischen Strafrecht*, in *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, v (1869), 297 sqq.; M. Duschak, *Das mosaische Recht*, Vienna, 1869; A. Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, ii. 250–286, London, 1875; idem, *National Religions and Universal Religions*, pp. 82 sqq., ib. 1882; A. P. Bissel, *The Law of Asylum in Israel*, Leipsic, 1884; Smith, *OTJC*, pp. 298 sqq., 428–430, and lectures xi.–xii.; G. Wildeboer, *De Pentateuchkritik en het mozaische Strafrecht*, in *Tijdschrift vor Strafrecht*, iv. 205 sqq., v. 251 sqq.; A. Bertholet, *Die Stellung der Israeliten und Juden zu den Fremden*, Freiburg, 1896; E. Day, *Social Life of the Hebrews*, New York, 1901; C. F. Kent, *Student's Old Testament*, vol. iv., ib., 1907; Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. 143 sqq., Eng. transl., consult Index; *DB*, iii. 64–72; *EB*, iii. 2714–30; *JE*, vii. 633–638; the literature cited under Hammurabi and His Code; and the works on Hebrew archeology and antiquities by DeWette, Ewald, Keil, Benzinger, and Nowack.

LAW, WILLIAM: English controversial and devotional writer; b. at King's Cliffe (28 m. n.e. of Northampton), Northamptonshire, 1686; d. there Apr. 9, 1761. He studied at Emmanuel College, Cambridge (B.A., 1708; M.A., 1712), and was ordained and elected fellow of his college in 1711. He was a fearless nonjuror, and, in consequence of his refusal to take the oaths of allegiance and abjuration on the accession of George I., forfeited his fellowship, and all prospects of advancement in the Church. Subsequently he took up his residence at Putney as tutor to Edward Gibbon, father of the historian. In 1740 he returned to King's Cliffe, where he spent the rest of his life in literary labors and works of charity. Law was one of the most eminent English writers on practical divinity in the eighteenth century. He was a genuine mystic, although he lived in a worldly and rationalistic age, and is best known by his *Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* (London, 1729 and often; new ed., 1906). With the exception of *The Pilgrim's Progress*, no book on practical religion in the language has, perhaps, been so highly praised. Gibbon, Dr. Johnson, Doddridge, and John Wesley, vie with each other in commending it as a masterpiece. At one time, Law was a kind of oracle with Wesley, and his influence upon early Methodism was of an almost formative character. In his later years he became an enthusiastic student of Jakob Boehme, but his strong churchly feeling and his sound English sense kept him from the wild errors and extravagances into which some of Boehme's disciples fell. In *The Spirit of Prayer* (1750; new ed., 1893) and *The Spirit of Love* (1754; new ed., 1893), Law unfolds his mystical views, and answers the objections which had been made to them. They are remarkable works, and abound in passages of uncommon spiritual force and beauty. Other well-known writings by Law are: *Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor* (1717–19; new ed., 1893), the most forceful piece of writing produced by the Bangorian controversy (see Hoadly, Benjamin); and *A Practical Treatise on Christian Perfection* (1726; abridged in part by J. Wesley, 1740; new ed., 1902). All of these may be found in his *Works* (9 vols., 1762; a beautiful reprint ed. G. B. Morgan, 9 vols., Brockenhurst, 1892–93.) Recent volumes of selections from Law are: *Characters and Characteristics of William Law* (ed. A. Whyte, London, 1893); *Wholly for God* (ed. A. Murray, 1894); *The Power of the Spirit* (ed. A. Murray, 1896); and *The Divine Indwelling* (ed. A. Murray, 1897); *Liberal and Mystic Writings* (New York, 1908).

Bibliography: J. H. Overton, *William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic*, London, 1881 (satisfactory); [C. Walton], *Notes and materials for an Adequate Biography of William Law*, ib. 1854 (privately printed); L. Stephen, *Hours in a Library*, 2 ser., ib. 1876; J. H. Overton, *The Church in England*, ii. 222, 228–231, 235, 240, ib. 1897; idem and F. Relton, *The English Church (1714–1800)*, ib. 1906; *DNB*, xxxii. 236–240; and the literature under Nonjurors, especially T. Lathbury, *Hist. of the Nonjurors; Cambridge Modern Hist.*, vi. 81 sqq., 1909.

LAWLOR, HUGH JACKSON: Church of Ireland; b. at Ballymena (33 m. n.n.w. of Belfast), County Antrim, Dec. 11, 1861. He studied at Trinity College, Dublin (B.A., 1882; M.A., 1885), was ordered deacon in 1885, and ordained priest in 1886. He was curate of Christ Church, Kingstown, Dublin 1885–93, and senior chaplain of St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh 1893–98. Since 1898 he has been professor of ecclesiastical history in the University of Dublin, where he had already been assistant to Archbishop King's lecturer in divinity in 1890–93. He was university preacher in 1898–1905, and has been examining chaplain to the bishop of Edinburgh since 1895, precentor of Trinity College since 1900 and of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, since 1902, and curate of Bray, Dublin, since 1905. He has edited: *The Rosslyn Missal* (London, 1899); G. T. Stokes' *Some Worthies of the Irish Church* (1900); and *The Diary of William King . . . Kept during his Imprisonment in Dublin Castle, 1689* (Dublin, 1903); and has written: *Chapters on the Book of Mulling* (Edinburgh, 1897); *The Kilcormic Missal* (Dublin, 1900); *Thoughts on Belief and Life* (sermons; 1900); and *The Manuscripts of the Vita Sancti Columbani* (1903). He has also contributed to the *Peplographia Dublinensis* (London, 1902) and *The Psalms of Israel* (1904).

LAWRENCE, WILLIAM: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Massachusetts; b. in Boston May 30, 1850. He was graduated at Harvard in 1871 and the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass., in 1875. He was ordered deacon in 1875 and priested in 1876. He became rector of Grace Church, Lawrence, Mass., in 1876, professor of homiletics and pastoral theology in the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge in 1884 (dean from 1888), and bishop of Massachusetts in 1893. He has written: *Life of Amos A [dams] Lawrence* (his father; Boston, 1888); *Visions and Service* (1896); *Life of Roger Wolcott, Governor of Massachusetts* (1902); and *Study of Phillips Brooks* (1903).

Bibliography: W. S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 359, New York, 1895.

LAY BAPTISM. See Baptism, III., 4.

LAY BROTHERS, LAY SISTERS. See Monasticism.

LAY CLERK: A designation given to certain members of the establishment of an English cathedral, whose duty it is to take a regular part in the choral services; they are sometimes known also as lay vicars, or vicars-choral. As in the case of the parish clerk, the name comes down from a time when these functions were performed by actual clerics; the qualifying adjective "lay," though etymologically importing a contradiction, being added to mark the difference in modern usage.

LAY COMMUNION (Lat. *communio laica*): Originally the status of the lay members of the Church as contrasted with the clergy, but restricted after the differentiation between clergy and laity to a deposition from the higher estate of the former to the lower rank of the latter. It is mentioned in this sense as early as the third century, especially as a punishment parallel with Deposition (q.v.). The punishment implied that a clergyman thus deposed resumed the status of a layman and had henceforth only lay rights, so that he received communion outside the choir instead of within the sanctuary, like the clergy. In modern Roman Catholic usage the development of the doctrine of the "indelible character" of bishops and priests has rendered absolute reduction to lay communion impossible. A cleric of major orders can be released from the duties of his office, especially from the vow of celibacy, only by dispensation of the pope. Those who hold minor orders, however, may return to the estate of laymen, and if they marry, they lose their benefices and all other privileges. (P. Hinschius†.)

LAY READER: A term applied in the Anglican Communion to laymen who are licensed to read portions of the service, usually in the absence of a clergyman. The system received its earliest wide development in the United States, where the number of clergy was inadequate to the needs of missionary expansion, and the services of the Episcopal Church were in many places kept up for long periods almost entirely by the ministrations of lay readers; but in recent years it has been adopted to a considerable extent in England also. In the United States a lay reader is required to have a license from the bishop, which is granted for a year at a time, and his powers are minutely defined by the canons.

LAYING ON OF HANDS: A religious rite, both Jewish and Christian. In the Old Testament, as a prescribed act, it appears first in Lev. i. 4, for the burnt-offering; in iii. 2 for the peace-offering; in iv. 4 for the sin-offering; in xvi. 21 for the sending away of the scapegoat on the Day of Atonement. It was used also in connection with the setting apart of priests (Ex. xxix. 10, 15, 19), and with the solemn punishment of idolatry (Lev. xxiv. 14). In Num. viii. 10, 12 the close connection between the use of the rite in sacrifice and that in consecration of priests is seen; whence it follows that it can not be used to denote the designation of representatives by the people, but rather signifies that they belong to God. The laying on of hands in the case of the scapegoat is a symbolic expression of participation between subject and object, the latter becoming or doing what properly belongs to the former. In the punishment of idolatry a similarly close connection is established between the bearing of witness and the punishment of the crime. It is an easy transition to the setting apart of Joshua as leader of the people by the laying on of the hands of Moses (Num. xxviii. 18; Deut. xxxiv. 9), in order to symbolize the participation of the younger in the exalted mission of the elder. From all these cases it appears that the act either meant the marking out of a special destiny for the object, expressed in the words which accompanied the act (for some words were always used), or else it signified transmission, either of an office, or of a blessing, or of sin.

In the Old Testament.

In the New Testament there is no express mention of the rite as a part of the law. But Christ performed a number of his miracles of healing by the laying on of hands (e.g., Mark v. 23, vi. 5, vii. 32), and his blessing was conveyed by the same act (Mark x. 13, 16). The same thing is related of the miracles of healing performed by the disciples (Acts vi. 6, ix. 12, 17, xxviii. 8). The expression of the will to heal or bless by this act is so natural that there is no need to attribute any magical effect to the mere touch, against which would be the failure of the parallel passages to mention it, and the same working of the word at a distance (e.g., Matt. viii. 5–13). The imposition of hands is merely symbolic of the healing will; but in accordance with the new dispensation, the effect closely accompanies the sign. It is not surprising to find the laying on of hands permanently connected with the washing away of sin in baptism and with the appointment to offices in the Church. In the former connection it so appears in Acts viii. 17 and Heb. vi. 2, but not as a separate, substantive act accompanying the baptism and with a blessing of its own. According to Acts ii. 38, the communication of the Holy Ghost is not a thing separate from baptism, but follows upon it. The separation of the laying on of hands from baptism, and its elevation into a right reserved to bishops in Confirmation (q.v.), is both contrary to Scripture and derogatory to the sacrament of baptism.

In the New Testament.

According to Acts vi. 6, xiii. 3, the appointment to office in the Church is conferred by prayer and the laying on of hands, which here again is nothing more than a natural symbol for the transmission of the power of the Holy Spirit necessary to their exercise. It is analogous to the Jewish priestly consecration (Num. viii. 10), as also to the ordination of readers or members of the Sanhedrin in the post-Maccabean period. But once more the New-Testament symbolism differs essentially from the Old; for as long as the service of the Church had not developed into a hierarchical constitution, the commissioning of a man with an office was supposed to include the transmission of the powers necessary to its exercise. Thus Paul could write to Timothy (I., iv. 14, II., i. 6) of the *charisma* which was in him through the laying on of his hands and the hands of the presbytery, and warn him (I., v. 22) to lay hands suddenly on no man. For later development, see CLERGY, IV.; CONFIRMATION; ORDINATION. (H. CREMER†.)

In the Church.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *DCA*, i. 828–829; *DB*, iii. 84–85; *EB*, ii. 1956.

LAYMAN'S MISSIONARY MOVEMENT. See MOVEMENT, LAYMAN'S MISSIONARY.

LAZARISTS: **1.** A name sometimes given to the Mekhitarists from their monastery on the island of San Lazzaro (2 m. s.e. of Venice). See MEKHITARISTS.

2. The common name of the congregation of secular priests for missions founded by St. Vincent de Paul from the old hospital of St. Lazare in Paris, where they had their mother house. See VINCENT DE PAUL, SAINT.

3. The Knights of St. Lazarus, organized for the care of the sick, especially lepers, probably at Jerusalem about the middle of the twelfth century. The tradition that the order was founded by the leprous King Baldwin IV. may be partially authentic, in that he probably showed special favor to a lazaretto in Jerusalem at that period, and knighted the brothers in attendance at it. After the thirteenth century, they spread throughout Europe, chiefly in Sicily, Lower Italy, and Germany, and most of all in France, where the lazaretto at Boigni (near Orléans) became the seat of the Grand Master. About 1490 the order was suppressed in Italy by Innocent VIII., only to be restored by Leo X. In 1572 they were united by Duke Emmanuel Philibert of Savoy with the Knights of St. Maurice (founded 1434 and following Benedictine rule), and the two orders now devoted themselves to the defense of Roman Catholic doctrine against Protestantism. The Knights of Saints Lazarus and Maurice still exist in Italy as a secular order established by Victor Emmanuel I. of Sardinia in 1816.

In France the Knights of St. Lazarus were united in 1607 by Henry IV. with the Knights of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, and under Louis XIV. they enjoyed special favor in 1672, receiving the estates of all extinct or suppressed French orders. After 1691, however, these estates were withdrawn, and henceforth the order slowly declined, being almost annihilated in the Revolution and being formally suppressed in 1830.

As special insignia both the Italian and French branches bore a green cross with eight points, while the French division added lilies between the arms of the cross and pictures of Our Lady of Mount Carmel and Lazarus rising from the dead.

(O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, i. 32, 54; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen;* G. Uhlhorn, *Die christliche Liebesthätigkeit im Mittelalter*, pp. 272–274, 493–494; Currier, *Religious Orders*, p. 218.

LEA, HENRY CHARLES: Historian; b. in Philadelphia Sept. 19, 1825; d. there Oct. 24, 1909. He was educated privately, and in 1841 entered the publishing-house of Lea and Blanchard, in his native city, becoming a member of the firm in 1851 and having sole control from 1865 to 1880, when he retired from active life. During the Civil War he was a member of the Union League, and always retained interest in municipal and civil reform. He is universally known by his studies of medieval ecclesiastical history, which comprise: *Superstition and Force: Essays on Wager of Law, Wager of Battle, Ordeal, and Torture* (Philadelphia, 1866); *Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church* (Boston, 1867; 3d ed., 2 vols., New York, 1907); *Studies in Church History: Rise of Temporal Power, Benefit of Clergy, Excommunication* (Philadelphia, 1869); *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages* (3 vols., New York, 1888); *Chapters from the Religious History of Spain connected with the Inquisition* (Philadelphia, 1890); *Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary in the Thirteenth Century* (1893); *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church* (3 vols., 1896); *The Moriscos of Spain, their Conversion and Expulsion* (1901); and *History of the Inquisition of Spain* (4 vols., New York, 1906–07); *Inquisition in the Spanish Dependencies* (1908).

LEAD (LEADE), JANE: English mystic; b. in Norfolk 1623; d. in London Aug. 19, 1704. Her maiden name was Ward. Receiving the usual education of the well-to-do English girl of the period, she heard, in her sixteenth year, a marvelous voice, which so impressed her that she devoted herself thenceforth to meditation. At the age of twenty-one she married her kinsman William Lead, and after his death in 1670 lived in retirement in London. Her innate tendency to mysticism was furthered by her study of Jakob Boehme and her acquaintance with John Pordage (q.v.), an Anglican clergyman, after 1652; but she was not content with the visions of others, her vivid imagination speedily producing phantasms of her own. These occurred almost nightly and were recorded after 1670 in her diary, *A Fountain of Gardens;* but her writings made little impression until 1693, when one of them was translated into Dutch. She now became famous in an hour. An important event in her life at this period was her acquaintance with an Oxford scholar Francis Lee, who became successively her adopted son, secretary, and son-in-law, and gave her writings their present literary form. About the pair gathered a circle of mystics who termed themselves the Philadelphian Society and kept in close touch with Germany and Holland. In her latter years she had to struggle against poverty and jealousy, though she was freed from the former by an annual pension of 400 florins given by Baron Kniphausen. She regarded herself as the mere instrument of her visions; and her works, though lacking in originality and style, exercised a wide influence in limited circles. Their character is sufficiently indicated by the titles: *The Heavenly Cloud now Breaking: The Lord Christ's Ascension-Ladder Sent Down* (London, 1681); *The Revelation of Revelations*, etc. (1683); *The Enochian Walks with God, Found out by a Spiritual Traveller, whose Face towards Mount Sion above was set*, etc. (1694); *The Laws of Paradise, Given Forth by Wisdom to a Translated Spirit* (1695); *The Wonders of God's Creation Manifested in the Variety of Eight Worlds as They were made known experimentally unto the Author* (1695); *A Message to the Philadelphian Society, Whithersoever Dispersed over the Whole Earth* (1696), followed by two similar messages in 1698; *The Tree of Faith or the Tree of Life Springing up in the Paradise of God*, etc. (1696); *The Ark of Faith* (1696); *A Fountain of Gardens Watered by the Rivers of Divine Pleasure and Springing up in all the Variety of Spiritual Plants*, etc. (4 vols., 1696–1701); *A Revelation of the Everlasting Gospel Message* (1697); *The Ascent to the Mount of Vision* (1698?); *The Signs of the Times: Forerunning the Kingdom of Christ and Evidencing when it is to Come* (1699); *The Wars of David and the Peaceable Reign of Solomon*, etc. (1700), with autobiographical material; *A Living Funeral Testimony, or Death Overcome and Drowned in the Life of Christ* (1702); and *The First Resurrection in Christ* (Amsterdam, 1704; dictated shortly before her death).

(Arnold Rüegg.)

Bibliography: An autobiography exists in *Sechs mystische Tractätlein*, pp. 413–423, Amsterdam, 1696. Consult: *DNB*, xxxii. 312–313; I. W. Jaeger, *Historia ecclesiastica* II., ii. 90–117, Hamburg, 1717; C. Walton, *Notes for an Adequate Biography of W. Law*, London, 1854; Canon Jenkins, in *British Quarterly Review*, July, 1873, pp. 181–187.

LEAGUE AND COVENANT, THE SOLEMN. See Covenanters, § 4.

LEANDER, SAINT: Metropolitan of Seville; b. at Cartagena, Spain, c. 550; d. Mar. 13, 600 or 601. The brother of Isidore of Seville, Fulgentius bishop of Ecija, and Florentina prioress of a nunnery, he was for many years a monk, and even at this early period seems to have exercised the influence on the Visigothic Prince Hermenegild, son of Leovigild, which ultimately converted him from Arianism to the catholic faith. Leander was exiled when Hermenegild rebelled against his father; and between 579 and 582 he went to Byzantium to induce Tiberius II. to send troops to the aid of the catholic party headed by his convert. Despite the powerful influence of Gregory the Great, Leander met with no success at Byzantium. After his return to Spain, he was consecrated bishop, or metropolitan, of Seville, probably in 584. In this capacity he not only confirmed Leovigild's successor Recared in his conversion to orthodoxy (587), but also aided materially in overcoming the opposition of the Arian bishops and in effecting the final conversion of the Visigoths from Arianism. He presided over the famous Synod of Toledo (589) which marked this event, and was the chief agent in adding the *filioque* to the creed of the Visigothic Church. His activity in behalf of his Church is also shown in his correspondence with Gregory the Great, who not only answered his questions carefully and cordially, but also sent him the pallium in 599 and dedicated to him his *Moralia in Jobum*. The extant works of Leander are: *Regula sanctimonialium, sive libellus de institutione virginum et contemptu mundi ad Florentinam sororem*, and *Homilia de triumpho ecclesiæ ob conversionem Gothorum* (delivered in the synod of Toledo). Both are printed in *MPL*, lxxii. 873–898. He also wrote two treatises against Arianism, one a sharp polemic, the other an orthodox catechism. In the ecclesiastical art of Spain Leander is always represented with his brother Isidore. (O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: Isidore of Seville, *De vir. ill.*, chap. xli.; *ASB*, March, ii. 275–280; *ASM*, i. 378–385; P. Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. 2, pp. 37 sqq., 66 sqq., 3 vols., Regensburg, 1862–79; E. Görres, in *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, 1872–73; idem, in *ZHT*, 1873, parts i., iv.; idem, in *ZWT*, xxv (1885), part iii., xxvi (1886), part i., pp. 36–50; *DCB*, iii. 637–640; and the literature under Isidore of Seville.

LEATHES, STANLEY: Church of England; b. at Ellesborough (20 m. e. of Oxford), Bucks, Mar. 21, 1830; d. at Much Hadham (7 m. n.e. of Hertford), Herts, Apr. 30, 1900. He studied at Jesus College, Cambridge (B.A., 1852; M.A., 1855), and after serving various churches was appointed in 1863 professor of Hebrew in King's College, London. He was also perpetual curate of St. Philip's, Regent Street, London, 1869–80, and rector of Cliffe-at-Hoo, Kent, 1880–89 and of Much Hadham, Herts, 1889–1900. He became a member of the Old-Testament company of revisers in 1870, and from 1876 until his death was prebendary of Caddington Major in St. Paul's Cathedral, examining chaplain to the bishop of Lichfield after 1891, and examiner in Scripture to the University of London after 1892. Among his publications, special mention may be made of his *Witness of the Old Testament to Christ* (London, 1868); *The Witness of St. Paul to Christ* (1869); *The Witness of St. John to Christ* (1870; these three volumes the Boyle lectures for 1868–70); *The Structure of the Old Testament* (1873); *The Cities Visited by St. Paul* (1873); *The Gospel its own Witness* (Hulsean lectures for 1873; 1874); *The Religion of the Christ* (Bampton lectures for 1874; 1874); *The Grounds of Christian Hope* (1877); *The Christian Creed, its Theory and Practice* (1877); *Old Testament Prophecy, its Witness as a Record of Divine Foreknowledge* (Warburton lectures; 1880); *The Foundations of Morality: Discourses upon the Ten Commandments* (1882); *Characteristics of Christianity* (1883); *Christ and the Bible* (1885); *The Law in the Prophets* (1891); and *The Testimony of the Earlier Prophetic Writers to the Primal Religion of Israel* (1898).

Bibliography: *DNB*, Supplement, iii. 85–86.

LEBANON: The western part of the mountain system of central Syria, starting near the sources of the Jordan and stretching northeast about one hundred miles. Over against it to the east is Antilebanon, while between the two ranges is the plain of Cœle-Syria (q.v.). The general character of the entire system is that of a mighty mountain wall between the coast and the interior. Lebanon begins at the south where the Litany breaks through on its way to the sea; its southern half reaches northward to the pass through which the railroad from Beirut to Damascus crosses at a height of 4,870 feet, and its highest point is Jabal Baruk, about 6,870 feet above the sea; its northern half extends to the valley of the Nahr al-Kabir where the latter flows westward into the Mediterranean. The northern half reaches a higher altitude and a greater variety of form than the southern. Instead of a single line of mountain crests there are numerous extended plateaus, reminding of the Alpine formation, though the Lebanon outlines are somewhat softer in outline. These plateau heights are known as Jabal Sannin (8,060 feet), Munaitira (8,680 feet), Khaswani (c. 9,000 feet), "the Cedars" (Arab. *Arz Libnan*, "Cedars of Lebanon"), and Akkar (6,610 feet). Arz Libnan culminates in two ranges of peaks running north and south, each row having five summits, of which the highest is Dahr al-Dubab in the western range, altitude 9,470 feet, just a little below the line of perpetual snow, if the observation of C. Diener be accepted. Yet there are isolated places where in some years snow lies continually in the hollows (Jer. xviii. 14), and moraines reveal traces of the glaciers of former times.

The Cedars.

The cedar groves near Bsharrah (40 m. n.e. of Beirut) cover part of a somewhat hilly basin about 6,180 feet high, and are surrounded by a high wall pierced by two gates which, however, continually stand open. Leo Anderlind counted on Oct. 23, 1884, 397 trees, of which eight were outside the wall, none of them higher than seventy-eight feet. The most vigorous trees are near the little Maronite chapel, one of which at the height of four feet from the ground has a girth of about forty-five feet. Of trees like this, which bespeak a great age, there are seven. Rauwolf in 1573 counted only twenty-four trees, but Burckhardt in 1810 reckoned in all 375, showing a very large increase during the last 300 years. Modern investigation shows the timber not to be especially durable and aromatic, but it was much valued in ancient times (I Kings vi. 20 sqq.; Isa. xiv. 8, xxxvii. 24, xliv. 14; Ezek. xxvii. 24, and the cuneiform inscriptions).

The width of the stretch between the mountains and the sea varies from seventeen miles at Sidon, to near eighteen and a half at Beirut and twenty-six and a third at Tripolis. The valleys of drainage in the south are largely the result of erosion in their lower course, in the upper course following geological cleavage. The northern watercourses are in general formed by gorges, the sides of which by the varying color of the strata and the mixture of vegetation present a beautiful effect. Sometimes these brooks have a subterranean channel, that of the Dog River (Nahr al-Kalb) having been followed for nearly two-thirds of a mile.

The descent from the crest to the shore is accomplished in great terraces, each of which has in popular usage its own name. The lowest is al-Sahil, the second is al-Wast, while the highest is al-Jurd; in the latter the chalky formation overlies the sandstone. The chalk formation is the conserver of the water from the melting snows, which percolates until it reaches the sandstone and is then brought to the surface. The numerous springs thus created have much to do with the fertility and consequent population of the region below. Much snow falls on the range during the snowy season, and the lower limit of snowfall is between 1,550 and 1,850 feet above the sea.

Flora and Fauna.

The flora in consequence of these favorable conditions is very rich, and the zones marked by the terraces have each its own characteristic plants. For those of the coast plain see Phenicia. In the middle region are found the mulberry, olive, and fig, then come nuts, the apricot, peach, almond, pear, apple, pomegranate, quince and pistachio. Vineyards are productive at an elevation of 3,100–4,600 feet, at which elevation diligence has produced some spots of singular fertility. The earlier and native flora of pines and cypresses has been superseded by the plane, maple, linden, arbutus, and oak. Alpine flora commences at an elevation of 7,400 feet. The zone of the mulberry is fertile also in fragrant plants such as the myrtle and the lavender (cf. Hos. xiv. 6). Continued occupation of the country and consequent despoilment has cleared away the former rich growth of forest so often mentioned in the Old Testament. Some pieces of woodland still remain and give shelter to the panther, bear, jackal, hyena, wild boar, and gazelle, though archeology shows that a much larger fauna existed in the woods which once reached nearly to the coast. There are indications that the primitive inhabitants of the region were cannibals.

Inhabitants.

The lofty and abrupt character of Lebanon as well as the great number of gorges make access exceedingly difficult and fit it as a retreat not easy to approach. It has consequently been the refuge during the centuries of those in difficulties, who found there security and freedom. Concerning the inhabitants of Lebanon only too little is known. Possibly the earliest known to history were the Amorites (q.v.), since the *Amor* of the Egyptian inscriptions includes this region. In the fourteenth century the Amorites fought the Egyptians, in the next century they broke out to the south, and when Israel settled in Canaan, they had founded two kingdoms in the mountain region and across the Jordan. Compare with this the independent Druse principality, 1595–1634 A.D. Among the historical examples of refugees to the region with achievement of comparative freedom is the case of the Maronites and the Druses (qq.v.). Present conditions are the result of the interference of Western powers, particularly of France. The region is now under a Christian governor who pays a yearly tribute to the Sublime Porte.

Cœle-Syria.

To the east of Lebanon is the great valley of Cœle-Syria, which begins at the Lake of Homs (altitude about 1,545 feet), and rises toward the south, bounded on the east by the range of Antilebanon. Its present name is *al-Bika*, " the Valley " (cf. the " valley of Lebanon " of Josh. xi. 17). The middle and southern part has a heavy fertile red-brown soil, though the climate is somewhat harsher than on the western slope. The highest point is not far from Baalbek, whence the Orontes flows toward the north and the Litany toward the south. Antilebanon begins at the south with the mighty Hermon. North of the post-road to Damascus the range spreads out fan-shaped into different spurs named by the inhabitants the " Eastern, Middle, and Western Mountains." Damascus lies under the " eastern " range and in this range rises the Amana of II Kings v. 12, the modern Barada. In the cuneiform inscriptions the names Amana and Senir (cf. Deut. iii. 9) are used for Antilebanon, Senir especially for the northern part. (H. Guthe.)

Bibliography: K. Baedeker, *Palestine and Syria*, London, 1906; J. L. Porter, *Five Years in Damascus*, 2 vols., ib. 1855; M. C. A. Churchill, *Mount Lebanon*, 4 vols., ib. 1862; R. F. Burton and C. F. T. Drake, *Unexplored Syria*, ib. 1872; O. Fraas, *Drei Monate am Libanon*, Stuttgart, 1876; G. Ebers and H. Guthe, *Palästina in Bild und Wort*, ii (1884), 1 sqq.; C. Diener, *Libanon*, Vienna, 1886; Leo Anderlind, in *ZDPV*, x (1887), 89 sqq.; M. Blanckenhorn, *Entwickelung des Kreidesystems in Mittel- und Nord-Syrien*, Cassel, 1890; K. von Fritsch, *Zumoffens Höhlenfunde im Libanon*, Halle, 1893; G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, London, 1897; *DB*, iii. 90–92; *EB*, iii. 2755–60; *JE*, vii. 656–657.

LEBBAEUS, leb-bî′ʊs (**LEBBEUS**). See Judas.

LEBWIN (LIAFWINE, LEBUINUS): English missionary to the Frisians and Saxons in the early part of Charlemagne's reign. He went to Gregory, abbot and priest at Utrecht (d. 775 or 776; see Gregory of Utrecht), who sent him with a certain Marcellinus or Marchelm to what is now Overyssel. Many of the people were already Christians and Lebwin built a church at Deventer and another on the west side of the Yssel. Inroads of heathen Saxons occurred, however, and according to Lebwin's biographer, Hucbald, he followed them to the heart of their country and appeared at their national assembly at Marklo on the lower Weser, clothed in his priestly vestments with a crucifix in one hand and the Gospel in the other, and delivered a threatening address. The infuriated warriors prepared to slay him with stakes which they tore from the ground and sharpened; but an old noble took his part and the outcome was that Lebwin was allowed to return to Deventer and work there unmolested the rest of his life. He is the patron saint of Deventer and is honored on July 25 and Nov. 12. The story of a missionary of the same name in Flanders, the patron of Ghent, who is said to have died c. 660, is probably an imitation of Lebwin of Deventer by one Falsarius of the eleventh century. (O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: Altfrid, *Vita S. Lindger* in *MGH*, *Script.*, ii (1829), 405–406, Eng. transl. in H. P. Cressy, *Church History of Brittany*, 1668; *ASM*, v. 21, 36; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, vi (1742), 210–221; Rettberg, *KD*, ii (1848), 405, 535–536; *DCB*, iii, 640–641; *DNB*, xxxii. 333; Hauck, *KD*, ii (1900), 348–349.

LECHLER, leн′ler, **GOTTHARD VICTOR:** German Lutheran; b. at Kloster Reichenbach, near Freudenstadt (40 m. s.w. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, Apr. 18, 1811; d. at Leipsic Dec. 26, 1888.

He studied at the gymnasium at Blaubeuren 1825–1829 and at the University of Tübingen 1829–34, and became repetent at Blaubeuren in 1835. He was transferred to Tübingen in the same capacity in 1838. He was appointed assistant pastor at Waiblingen in 1841 and dean at Knittlingen in 1853, whence he was called to Leipsic in 1858 as superintendent and pastor at St. Thomas' and professor of theology at the university. He lectured on ecclesiastical history, symbolics, canon law, and ecclesiastical polity, and also on certain books of the New Testament, especially Acts and the Epistle of James. Later he became a member of the Saxon diet, and in 1880 privy ecclesiastical councilor. In 1883 he resigned his superintendency and pastorate in order to devote his closing years entirely to his academic and literary work. Some of his more important books are: *Geschichte des englischen Deismus* (Stuttgart, 1841); *Das apostolische und nachapostolische Zeitalter* (Haarlem, 1851; Eng. transl., *Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1886); *Geschichte der Presbyterial- und Synodalverfassung* (Leyden, 1854); and *Johannes von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation* (2 vols., Leipsic, 1873; Eng. transl., *John Wiclif and his English Precursors*, 2 vols., London, 1878, new ed., 1884). In collaboration with K. Gerok he prepared the commentary on Acts for Lange's Bibelwerk (Bielefeld, 1862; Eng. transl., New York, 1869). Other works by Lechler are, *De Thoma Bradwardino* (Leipsic, 1862); *Der Kirchenstaat und die Opposition gegen den päpstlichen Absolutismus im Anfang des xiv. Jahrhunderts* (1870); *Urkundenfunde des christlichen Altertums* (2 parts, 1885–86); and *Johannes Hus* (Halle, 1890). THEODOR FICKER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. Meusel, *Kirchliches Handlexikon*, iv. 201, Leipsic, 1894.

LECLERC, le-clārc′, **JEAN.** See CLERICUS, JOHANNES.

LECOT, le-cō′, **VICTOR LUCIEN SULPICE:** Cardinal; b. at Montescourt (40 m. n.w. of Reims), Jan. 8, 1831; d. at Chambery Dec. 19, 1908. He studied at the Petit Séminaire of Compiègne and at the Grand Séminaire of Beauvais, and was appointed professor at the Petit Séminaire of Noyon (Oise). During the Franco-German war, he was chaplain in the French army, and after being parish priest of St. Antoine de Compiègne 1872–86, was consecrated bishop of Dijon in the latter year. In 1890 he was enthroned archbishop of Bordeaux, and in 1893 was created cardinal priest of Santa Pudenziana.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Der Papst, die Regierung und die Verwaltung der heiligen Kirche in Rome*, pp. 185, 187, 188, Munich, 1904.

LECTERN: Originally a high, sloping desk, either single or double, which stood in the middle of the choirs of churches, and was used as a rest for the *antiphonarium* and *lectionarium* from which the cantors sang the antiphons and lessons. In this shape it is retained in some Roman Catholic churches at the present day; but it occurs much more frequently, usually in the shape of an eagle with outstretched wings and frequently of brass, in Anglican churches as a support for the Bible from which the lessons are read at morning and evening prayer. In this latter use it stands as a rule either beneath or just outside the chancel arch.

LECTION, LECTIONARY. See EVANGELIARIUM; PERICOPE.

LECTOR ("Reader"; Gk. *Anagnōstēs*): In the early Church, an ecclesiastic in minor orders appointed to read to the congregation from the Scriptures and other religious writings. From the very first the oral reading of the sacred Scriptures occupied a large place in religious services, and for a long time it was the sole, or at least the principal means of imparting Scriptural knowledge to the congregation. Since during the first two centuries Christianity diffused itself especially among the poorer classes, and the congregations were frequently small, it was not always easy to find a competent reader of the sacred books, written as they were without spacing between the words. The position of the lector in the congregation was consequently an important one. In addition to reading, he often expounded passages of Scripture, especially as the sermon was not yet an official duty. Alphæus, lector and exorcist at Cæsarea (d. 303), was "preacher and teacher of the word of God" at that place, "and had great fortitude before every one" (Eusebius, *De martyribus Palestinæ*, i.). During the early centuries the lector appears to have been reckoned with the spiritual leaders of the congregations, with the prophets, evangelists, and teachers who were accustomed to conduct divine worship. Certain expressions in liturgies of the later time reflect the ancient estimate of the lector's office; thus the *Statuta ecclesiæ antiqua* (viii.) observe of the prospective lector, "he is to have a part with those who minister the word of God," consequently the lector occasionally took precedence of the deacon and subdeacon. The development of polity in the Church catholic from the second century downward was unfavorable to the dignity of the lector's office. The bishop or the presbyter was accustomed to appropriate the sermon, and sometimes the preacher included the Scriptural reading as a part of his functions, with the result that the lector became superfluous. In the ceremonially ordered public worship from the fourth century onward, the reading of the Gospel was regularly reserved to the deacons or presbyters, and the lector came to be reckoned with the *clerici minores*, being of the next to the lowest rank in the order of ecclesiastical promotion (Siricius, *Ad Himerium*, xiii.). In many church districts, children and even catechumens were admitted to the lector's rank, an impropriety which Justinian sought to correct. The ritual for the installation of the lector was furnished by the liturgies. It usually consisted in the delivery of the codex of the sacred Scriptures. In the Roman Catholic Church the lector's *ordo* still exists, but in a merely formal sense. See ORDERS, HOLY. H. ACHELIS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The earlier literature is given in A. Harnack, *Ueber den Ursprung des Lektorats und der anderen niederen Weihen*, in *TU*, ii. 5 (1886), 57 sqq. Consult: Bingham, *Origines*, III., v.; F. Wieland, *Die genetische Entwickelung der . . . ordines minores*, Rome, 1892.

LEDA BIBLE. See BIBLE VERSIONS, B, IV., § 9.

LEE, ANN: Foundress of the sect of Shakers in America; b. in Manchester, Eng., Feb. 28, 1736; d. at Watervliet, N. Y., Sept. 8, 1784. Her father was a blacksmith and gave her no education, but put her at work in a cotton-factory; afterward she served as cook in the Manchester Infirmary. In 1758 she married Abraham Standerin (so spelled in the register, but usually given as Standley or Stanley), a blacksmith, by whom she had four children, who died in infancy. In 1758 she had joined the Manchester society called the "Shaking Quakers," which had seceded from the Society of Friends and was under the leadership of James Wardley. Being naturally excitable, she was quickly affected by the religious exercises of the society, and began to practise austerities, to have visions, and to make revelations. But it was not until 1770 that she had the epoch-making revelation against marriage, and began her "testimony against all lustful gratifications as the source and foundation of human corruption and misery," a course which led to her imprisonment. It was then that Christ appeared to her in a vision, and revealed to her that she was the second incarnation of Christ, and thus the head of all women, as he was the head of all men. From that time forth she was called by her followers "Mother Ann," and believed by them to be perfectly righteous.

Henceforth she claimed to be directed by revelations and visions. In 1774 she came with her followers to America, and finally settled, in the spring of 1776, at Niskeyuna, later Watervliet, near Albany, N. Y. In 1775 or 1776 she and her husband parted, Shaker documents asserting that he deserted her after having been tenderly nursed through a dangerous illness. During the Revolutionary War she was accused of treasonable correspondence with the British and cast into prison, but was released by Gov. Clinton, 1777. At a later period (1780) she was again imprisoned for refusing to take the oath of allegiance to the State of New York, which she could not conscientiously do, but was released without trial by the same governor. Persecution had the usual effect of increasing the numbers of the persecuted. Taking advantage of a revival of religion (1779), she gathered many converts, and in 1780 removed the community to New Lebanon, Columbia County, N. Y. From 1781 to 1783 she went through New England on a missionary tour. Her influence is still felt by the Shakers, who revere her memory. See COMMUNISM, II., 10.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Anna White and Leila S. Taylor, *Shakerism, Its Meaning and Message*, pp. 13–67, Columbus, Ohio, 1904; T. Dwight, *Travels in New England*, iii. 149 sqq., New York, 1822; *DNB*, xxxii. 343.

LEE, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN: African Methodist Episcopal bishop; b. at Bridgeton, N. J., Sept. 18, 1841. He was educated at Wilberforce University (A.B., 1872), where he was professor of homiletics (1873–75) and president (1876–84). From 1884 to 1892 he was editor of *The Christian Recorder*, and in the latter year was elected bishop of his denomination.

LEE, FREDERICK GEORGE: Church of England; b. at Thame (13 m. e. of Oxford), Oxfordshire, Jan. 6, 1832; d. at Lambeth, London, Jan. 23, 1902. He studied at St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford (D.C.L., 1854), and was curate of Sunningwell, Berks, 1854–56, then for several years domestic chaplain to the duke of Leeds and earl of Morton, while from 1867 almost until his death he was vicar of All Saints', Lambeth. He was a High-churchman, and shortly before his death was received into the Roman Catholic Church. He was a prolific author, among his principal works being: *The Beauty of Holiness* (London, 1859); *Notitia Liturgica* (1866); *The Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England Maintained and Vindicated* (1869); *The Christian Doctrine of Prayer for the Departed* (1872); *The Other World: or, Glimpses of the Supernatural* (2 vols., 1875); *Historical Sketches of the Reformation* (1879); *The Church under Queen Elizabeth* (2 vols., 1880); *History and Antiquities of the Church of Thame* (1883); *Reginald Pole, Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury* (1887); *The Church of Haddenham, Bucks* (1888); *King Edward the Sixth, Supreme Head* (1889); *The Sinless Conception of the Mother of God* (1891); and *The Church of St. Mary, Long Crendon* (1891). He compiled *A Glossary of Liturgical and Ecclesiastical Terms* (London, 1877), while among the numerous works which he edited were the second and subsequent editions of the *Directorium Anglicanum* (London, 1865) and its abridgment, *Manuale Clericorum* (1874); *Altar Service Book, according to the Use of the United Church of England and Ireland* (1867); and *The Communion Office of the Church of Scotland* (Aberdeen, 1869).

LEE, JESSE: Founder of Methodism in New England; b. in Prince George County, Md., Mar. 12, 1758; d. at Hillsboro, Md., Sept. 12, 1816. He removed to North Carolina 1777, preached his first sermon in 1779, entered the itinerant ministry in 1783, and during the next six years labored in North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, and New Jersey. In 1789 he was sent by conference to the Stamford circuit, Conn. For the next eleven years he traveled throughout the New England States, preaching often in barns, private houses, or on highways. In 1796 he became assistant to Bishop Asbury. He returned to the South in 1800.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: L. M. Lee, *Life and Times of Jesse Lee*, Richmond, 1848; W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vii. 80–87, New York, 1861; J. M. Buckley, *American Church History Series*, vol. v., ib. 1896.

LEE, SAMUEL: English Orientalist; b. at Longnor (8 m. s. of Shrewsbury), Shropshire, May 14, 1783, d. at Barley (16 m. n.n.e. of Hertford), Hertfordshire, Dec. 16, 1852. He received his elementary training at a charity school, and at the age of twelve was apprenticed to a Shrewsbury carpenter. While working at his trade he became interested in the study of languages, and before he was twenty-five he had learned, without a teacher, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic, Samaritan, Syriac, Persian, and Hindustani. To these languages he subsequently added a dozen others. The accidental loss of his tools compelled him to look for other means of a livelihood, and in 1810 he became master of Bowdler's Foundation School, Shrewsbury. In 1813, under the auspices of the Church Missionary Society, he entered Queen's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1818; M.A., 1819; B.D., 1827; D.D., 1833). In 1819 he was appointed professor of Arabic at Cambridge, and from 1831 to 1848 was regius professor of Hebrew. He was also a canon in Bristol Cathedral after 1831, vicar of Banwell, Somerset, 1831–38, and rector of Barley, Hertfordshire, 1838–52. His publications include editions of the Scriptures in Arabic, Coptic, Persian, Syriac, and Hindustani; *A Grammar of the Hebrew Language* (London, 1827); *Prolegomena* to Bagster's Polyglot Bible (1829); *Six Sermons on the Study of the Holy Scriptures* (1830); *A Brief History of the Church of Abyssinia* (in S. Gobat's *Journal*, 1834); a translation of Job, with commentary (1837); *A Lexicon, Hebrew, Chaldee, and English* (1840); and *An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy* (1849).

Bibliography: Alice M. Lee, *A Scholar of a Past Generation; . . . Memoir of . . . Samuel Lee*, London, 1896; *DNB*, xxxii. 378.

LEE, WILLIAM: Church of Scotland; b. in Edinburgh Nov. 6, 1817; d. in Glasgow Oct. 10, 1886. His father was John Lee, principal of the University of Edinburgh and professsor of divinity. He was educated at the high school and the University of Edinburgh, and in 1842 was chaplain to the marquis of Bute, lord high commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. In the following year he was appointed to the parish of Roxburgh, where he ministered with much faithfulness and acceptance for over thirty years. Pastoral duties did not prevent him from engaging in literary labor, or from taking an active part in the general work of the church and in the business of its Supreme Court. During his Roxburgh ministry he edited his father's *Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1860); contributed to Cassell's *Bible Educator*, and published *The Increase of Faith* (1867), and *The Days of the Son of Man* (1874). In 1874 his learning and ability led to his appointment by the crown to the chair of church history in the University of Glasgow. He devoted himself with much zeal to the work of his classes, and to the well-being of his students, but found time also to continue his contributions to literature, his most noteworthy writings during this later period being *Scripture Biographies* in the *Bible Educator*. Henry Cowan.

LEENHOF, lên′həf, **FREDERIK VAN:** Dutch Protestant; b. at Middelburg Aug., 1647; d. at Zwolle (52 m. e.n.e. of Amsterdam) 1712. In 1670 he became pastor of the Flemish congregation in Abbeville in Picardy; in 1672 he was called to Nieuwvliet. In 1678–79 he was preacher at the extraordinary embassy of the general states at the court of Louis XIV., but returned to his native country in 1679 as court preacher to Albertina Agnes, the widow of the Frisian stadtholder. In 1680 he became preacher at Velzen, and in 1681 at Zwolle. He was an adherent of Cartesian Cocceianism; and in the history of Dutch Protestantism he is known in connection with the controversy produced by his book, *Den Hemel op aarden; of een korte en klaare beschrijving van de waare en stantvastige blydschap* (Zwolle, 1703), which he wrote to refute those who sought the test of Christianity in a morbid gloom. He maintained that the true service of God must lead to a pure enjoyment of true happiness on earth. On being accused of Spinozism and Hattemism (see Hattem, Pontiaan van), he defended himself in another work, *Den hemel op aarden, opgehelderd van de nevelen van misverstand en vooroordeelen* (Zwolle, 1704). In the course of the ensuing controversy the entire Dutch Church was thrown into a turmoil, and finally Van Leenhof was deposed by the Synod of Overyssel in 1708. The consistory and magistrates of Zwolle, as well as the estates of Overyssel, did not acknowledge the legality of his deposition, but to preserve peace Van Leenhof voluntarily resigned his charge Jan. 1, 1711. Other works are, *De keten der bijbelsche godgeleerdheid* (2 parts, Middelburg, 1678); *Kort onderwijs in de chr. religie volgens d'ordre van de H. Schrift* (4th ed., 1680); *De geest en conscientie des menschen in haar eygen wezen en werkingen eenvoudiglijk verklaart* (3d ed., Amsterdam, 1683). (S. D. van Veen.)

Bibliography: G. F. Jenichen, *Historia Spinozismi Leenhofiani*, Leipsic, 1707; A. Ypey and I. J. Dermout, *Geschiedenis der nederlandsche hervormde Kerk*, iii. 240 sqq., 4 vols., Breda, 1819–27; E. J. Lorgion, *De nederlandsche hervormde Kerk in Friesland*, pp. 216–223, Groningen, 1848; L. A. van Langeraad, *De nederlandsche Ambassade-Kapel te Parijs*, i. 238–245, The Hague, 1893 (gives sources and further literature).

LEFÈVRE D'ÉTAPLES, le-fêvr′ dê″tā′pl, **JACQUES.** See Faber (Fabri) Stapulensis, Jacobus.

LEFFINGWELL, CHARLES WESLEY: Protestant Episcopalian; b. at Ellington, Conn., Dec. 5, 1840. He studied at Union College and at Knox College, Galesburg, Ill. (graduated 1862). He was vice-principal of a military school at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 1862–65, and then studied theology at Nashotah Theological Seminary, Nashotah, Wis., being graduated in 1867. He was ordered deacon and ordained priest in 1867, and was curate of St. James', Chicago, 1867–68. In 1868 he established at Knoxville, Ill., St. Mary's School for girls, of which he has since been rector, as well as of St. Alban's School for boys, which he founded at Knoxville in 1890. Since 1879 he has been editor of the weekly *Living Church*, an organ of the High-church party.

LEFROY, WILLIAM: Church of England; b. at Dublin Nov. 6, 1836; d. at Zermatt (72 m. e.s.e. of Geneva), Switzerland, Aug. 12, 1909. He studied at Trinity College, Dublin (B.A., 1863), was ordered deacon in 1864, and ordained priest in 1865. He was curate of Christ Church, Cork, 1864–66 and perpetual curate of St. Andrew's, Liverpool, 1866–89. After 1889 he was dean of Norwich, and also vicar of St. Mary in the Marsh, Norwich, after 1903. He was honorary canon of Liverpool 1880–87, rural dean of South Liverpool 1884–87, proctor for the archdeaconry of Warrington 1886, and archdeacon of Warrington 1887–89. He was Donnellan lecturer at Trinity College, Dublin, 1887–88, and was regarded as the founder of the Clergy Sustentation Fund. Among his writings, special mention may be made of his *Lecture on Scepticism* (Liverpool, 1868); *Plea for the Old Catholic Movement* (London, 1875); *Pleadings for Christ* (1878); *The Christian Minis-*

try (1890); *The Christian's Start* (1890); *The Christian's Duties* (1891); *The Christian's Responsibilities* (1892); *All the Counsel of God* (1893); *Agoniæ Christi* (1893); *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History* (1896); *History of Norwich Cathedral* (1897); and *Christian Science contrasted with Christian Faith* (1903).

Bibliography: B. B. Gould, *In Memoriam: The Very Rev. William Lefroy*, London, 1909.

LEGATES AND NUNCIOS, PAPAL: Representatives of the pope. These were present at all the ecumenical councils in the East except the fifth (Constantinople, 553), but neither held the actual presidency nor exercised a really decisive influence. What they were able to accomplish depended upon the position of their principal at the moment, and especially his relation to the emperor. Besides the pope, they frequently represented Roman synods also, or, in a word, the whole Roman Church. In addition to these delegates for a special purpose, from the pontificate of Leo I. (440–461) until at least the end of the seventh century, the popes, like other patriarchs, had permanent representatives at the imperial court, known as *apocrisiarii* or *responsales* (see Apocrisiarius); but these were simply intermediaries, and had no jurisdiction in the later sense. The canons of Sardica (343) conceded to the pope a superior jurisdiction, which was fully recognized on the part of the State by the constitution of Valentinian III. (445). On the basis of this, from the end of the fourth century the popes entrusted the exercise of such jurisdiction to individual bishops (e.g., those of Thessalonica and Arles), who were designated as apostolic vicars. In the succeeding centuries other representatives appear for the decision of definite questions, both ecclesiastical and political. These were known as *missi* or *legati apostolicæ sedis*, in a few cases as *legati a latere*. Their position became more important with the rise of the papal power from Gregory VII. onward. Gregory emphasized this by inserting in the episcopal oath of fealty (where it remains to this day) the clause "I will treat with honor a Roman legate going or coming and assist him in his necessities." Legates were now more frequently employed, sometimes empowered for whole countries, and endowed with great powers, including even that of a concurrent jurisdiction as ordinaries, in the pope's name, with the bishops.

Early Papal Representatives.

Development and Classification.

The legatine system was formulated and developed in the decretals, and the different classes are definitely distinguished. (1) The *legatus natus* was one to whom the legatine authority came *ex officio* as the incumbent of a special archiepiscopal see (e.g., Canterbury). His powers were originally those of legates in general, especially that of concurrent jurisdiction with the bishops of all the dioceses in his province; he appears as *ordinarius ordinariorum*, competent to decide in the first instance cases brought before him by the parties. With the sixteenth century began a gradual disappearance of these powers, which finally left little besides the bare title. The king of Hungary claimed the position of a *legatus natus*, and a similar claim on the part of the king of Sicily was the foundation of the so-called *monarchia Sicula*. (2) The class called *legati missi* in the decretals were sometimes entitled *nuncii apostolici* by the writers of the thirteenth century, and more often in the papal briefs of the fourteenth, until the title of nuncio became the regular one. They were sent out on a special mission, exercising an ordinary jurisdiction in the territory affected, and until the sixteenth century concurrently with the bishops. They had the power to decide many but not all reserved cases (see Casus Reservati) without special faculties, and to grant indulgences not extending beyond one year. Red robes, a white horse, and golden spurs were among their insignia. (3) Legates *a latere*, sent "from the (pope's) side," i.e., cardinals, exercised practically the authority of the pope in person, on the analogy of the senators sent out by the later emperors to represent them. Their ordinary jurisdiction in a province enabled them to suspend the entire authority of a bishop, to absolve from all reserved cases, to confirm the election of archbishops and bishops (even in the case of exempt sees), to take precedence of all bishops and preside at councils, and to use the insignia of a cross carried before them and a canopy over them. They were not, however, permitted to depose bishops, to divide or unite dioceses, or to interfere with elective dignities in cathedral and collegiate churches. Distinguished from these plenipotentiary legates *a latere* were certain extraordinary ones sent on a special mission, as to convoke a council or deal with a sovereign. Nuncios were occasionally sent out with the powers of legates *a latere*.

Modern Modifications.

Many complaints were made against the legates, and led to a substantial alteration of the system. Leo X. at the Lateran Council of 1515 ordered the cardinal-legates to reside in the places to which they were sent and attend to their duties. The Council of Trent (session xxiv., chap. 20) liberated the episcopal jurisdiction from legatine interference, and the Congregation of the Council subsequently, on the basis of this decree, decided numerous cases against legates. The Council, however, allowed them to share with the bishops in investigating the canonical requirements for cathedral dignitaries and still conceded to them an appellate jurisdiction (ib. chap. vii.). The altered conditions after the Reformation led to the establishment of permanent nunciatures. Such had existed at the courts of Vienna and Warsaw from the beginning of the sixteenth century, but here they were political in origin. Others were now established—at Cologne for the Rhine district in 1582, at Lucerne for Protestant Switzerland and southwestern Germany in 1586, and at Brussels for the Netherlands in 1600. Their work was to a large extent the supervision of missionary efforts, though their ordinary faculties permitted them to concur with the episcopal jurisdiction in such parts of their territory as had remained Roman Catholic. In modern times the Roman Catholic Church regards the system of the decretals as still legally in force. Nuncios are now in practise sent much oftener than legates *a latere*, and there is a considerable number of permanent nunciatures. According to the order of precedence adopted at the Congress of Vienna, legates and nuncios are considered by secular governments to have the rank of ambassadors. This recognition of the pope's right to send diplomatic representatives formerly rested, of course, partly on his position as a temporal sovereign; since 1870 it has been based not upon his still asserted claims to that position, but upon his undoubted social importance as the absolute spiritual ruler of so many millions. The recognition, however, extends only to the matters in which the nuncio is accredited to the government, not to the internal ecclesiastical matters for the regulation of which he holds powers from the pope. In a word, the attitude of modern non-Catholic governments toward this matter is the same which has been assumed in the making of Concordats.

(J. F. von Schulte †.)

Bibliography: P. A. Gambarus, *Tractatus de officio atque auctoritate legati de latere*, Venice, 1521; S. F. de la Torre, *De auctoritate, gradu et terminis legati a latere*, Rome, 1656; L. Thomassin, *Vetus et novæ ecclesiæ disciplina*, part i., book ii., chaps. 107–108, 117–118, 3 vols., Paris, 1728; A. J. Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, iii. 162 sqq., Mainz, 1826; P. Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, i. 498–499, Berlin, 1870; J. F. von Schulte, *Die Stellung der Konzilien, Päpste und Bischöfe*, pp. 64 sqq., Prague, 1871.

LEGEND, LEGENDARY: In present usage "legend" denotes almost any fictitious narrative, ancient or modern, or a recital of true history distorted by the fancy or subjectively colored. It is well, however, to confine the term to the religious domain, as many recent literary historians have done. Legends and saints belong together. Only in so far as heroes, ancient and modern alike, enjoy a sort of saint-worship, may one speak of legend in respect to them; and since worship of saints is not restricted to the Christian medieval era, one may transfer the idea of legend to other religions. This usage is modern. About 1180 Johannes Beleth (*De divinis officiis*, lx., in *MPL*, ccii. 66; cf. William Durand, *Rationale divinorum officiorum*, VI., i. 29) calls the book "which treats of the life and death of confessors and is read at their festivals" a legendary. This presupposes the term *legenda* (i.e., "things to be read"), which, however, first appears in the thirteenth century and more frequently in the fifteenth. Originally distinguished from the *passiones* of martyrs, *legendæ* or *legendarii* later included the entire aggregate of the lives and passions of the saints; and their ecclesiastical use in public reading or chanting receded in favor of private edification.

Christian legend is as old as Christianity itself. Like a wild vine it soon encircled the Gospel and created an apocryphal history of the apostles, wherein they are heroes at once of asceticism and of martyrdom. It transformed genuine martyrology according to the taste of later times and created incredible monastic tales. The products of the fourth and fifth centuries constitute the foundation story, the common fund of Christendom's hagiography, but legendary creation continued, finding new motives in every new saint, in every translation of relics, and in every church foundation.

Of literary affinity with fiction, legend aims to entertain, but likewise to edify along definite religious and moral lines. The hero is supposed to serve as a pattern of beneficence, renunciation, self-sacrifice, constancy, and triumph over the devil. The invisible is to appear tangibly—God's providence toward the devout, the hearing of their prayers, the reward of the righteous, and the punishment of the impious. Miracle displays God's intervention in its broadest light. In self-defense the legend also appropriates rationalizing traits, and seeks to enhance its credibility by proclaiming the refutation and punishment of doubters.

Legend borrows its materials first of all from historic reminiscence, but adorns the same and combines it with motives of its own. The fancy is ever creating new forms by transferring details from place to place and from one person to another. The same motive often occurs in an Indian myth, a tale of the Thousand and One Nights, and a medieval legend of the saints. From this fact Grimm's school inferred a common Indo-Germanic origin. Of late there has been talk of literary migrations. Usener's theory of myths which have undergone a Christian transformation has been sharply criticized by Delehaye; the points of contact are frequently of a purely external kind, and the features really common are story-telling motives.

The legend was early incorporated into the liturgy. Records of martyrdom were collected to be read aloud as early as by Eusebius, and afterward Palladius, Rufinus, and others gathered ascetic narratives for the edification of monks. From these beginnings arose the great collective works (see Acta Martyrum, Acta Sanctorum). Legends were worked over into sermons (Symeon Metaphrastes, *Sermones de sanctis*), and also largely utilized as poetry (Prudentius, *Peristephanon;* Paulinus of Nola, *Carmina natalicia*). In the medieval era the rhapsody of the Madonna and the praise of heroic renunciation occur as the counterparts of secular minstrelsy and chivalrous adventures. The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries turned the entire *Legenda aurea* (see Jacobus da Varagine) into verse and found edification in miracle plays. Graphic art, especially church painting, considered its most important task to be the illustration of legend. Thus the legend enveloped the whole intellectual life of the Middle Ages.

In the later Roman Catholicism legends still have a place, though the critics have taken much away from them. Luther defamed legends as *Lügenden* ("lie-gends"), yet he appreciated their practical utility. Hence an Evangelical history of martyrs could thrive on Lutheran soil, whereas Calvinism assumed an attitude of gruff rejection. While the Enlightenment saw nothing in legends but superstition and priestcraft, romanticism found in them the revelation of the deepest secrets of the popular soul. Modern philological and historical investigation has discovered rich mines in this field. Indeed ecclesiastical history itself is taking more and more note of the fact that the legend, with ceremonial and custom, offers the best embodiment of the popular theology. E. von Dobschütz.

Bibliography: J. G. von Herder, *Werke*, ed. B. Suphan, xvi. 387–398, xxviii. 167–246, 31 vols., Berlin, 1877–93;

K. G. Vogel, in *Historisch-theologische Abhandlungen*, iii (1824), 141–179; Migne, *Dictionnaire des légendes*, Paris, 1855; idem, *Dictionnaire des apocryphes*, ib. 1856; H. von Eicken, *Geschichte und System der mittelalterlichen Weltanschauung*, Stuttgart, 1887; F. Görres, in *Historische Zeitschrift*, lvii (1887), 212–221; J. J. I. von Döllinger, *Akademische Vorträge*, i. 180 sqq., Bonn, 1890; A. Harnack, in *Protestantisches Jahrbuch*, lxv (1890), 249–265; Mrs. A. Jameson, *Sacred and Legendary Art*, London, 1890; idem, *Legends of the Madonna, Legends of Saints and Martyrs, Legends of the Monastic Orders*, 3 vols., London, 1903; A. Ehrhard, *Altchristliche Literatur*, i. 539 sqq., Freiburg, 1894; A. Maury, *Croyances et légendes du moyen-âge*, Paris, 1896; E. Male, *L'Art religieux du xiii. siècle en France*, ib. 1898; H. Achelis, *Die Martyrologien, ihre Geschichte und ihr Wert*, Göttingen, 1900; C. A. Bernoulli, *Die Heiligen der Merovinger*, Tübingen, 1900; G. Paris, *Poèmes et légendes du moyen-âge*, Paris, 1900; idem, *Légendes du moyen-âge*, ib. 1903; P. Toldo, in *Studien zur vergleichenden Literatur-Geschichte*, 1901-1902; E. Lucius, *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults*, Tübingen, 1904; H. Delehaye, *Les Légendes hagiographiques*, Paris, 1905; H. H. Gunter, *Legenden-Studien*, Cologne, 1906. The best lists of lives of the saints are to be found in the works issued by the Bollandists—*Bibliotheca hagiographa Graeca*, Brussels, 1895 sqq., and *Bibliotheca hagiographa Latina*, ib., 1898 sqq.

LEGER, JEAN: French Protestant; b. at Villa Secca (in the valley of San Martino, Piedmont) Feb. 2, 1615; d., probably at Leyden, after 1665. At the age of fourteen he went to Geneva to study, and remained there until 1639, when he went to Turin. He found the city in great commotion, since the province of Piedmont was overrun by the French and Spaniards. Leger himself was exposed to peril and was taken prisoner, but escaped by his presence of mind. On Sept. 27, of the same year, the synod of San Germano appointed him pastor of the two churches of Prali and Rodoreto. In 1643 he succeeded his uncle Antoine as pastor of San Giovanni in the valley of Luserna, and there came into repeated conflicts with the monks. His popularity was so great that his opponents at first sought to win him over, but this failed, and they then resorted to persecution. The valley of Luserna was overrun with troops, who pursued the fugitives to the heights of Angrogna. Leger himself escaped, and as the moderator of his church gathered his coreligionists about him, urged them to remain true to their faith and native land, and hastened to seek aid and comfort for them in foreign courts. He stopped in Paris, where he issued a manifesto addressed to all the powers, which impressed even Louis XIV., while Cromwell sent Sir Samuel Moreland to the court of Turin to lodge an emphatic protest. About the same time Leger returned to the Waldensian valleys, and a treaty of peace was signed Aug. 18, 1655, restoring the Waldensians to their rights, but forbidding them instruction in their religion. Leger refused to obey this, and was condemned to death Jan. 12, 1661. He was cited to appear at Turin and was resentenced on Sept. 17. Once more he fled, and passing through Geneva settled at Leyden as pastor of the Walloon Church, where he seems to have spent the remainder of his life, and where he wrote his *Histoire générale des églises évangéliques de Piémont ou vaudoises* (2 vols., Leyden, 1669), the first part treating of the Waldensian doctrines and discipline as preserved in purity and without interruption or the need of a reformation from the time they emerged from heathendom, while the second part gives a history of the persecutions which his coreligionists endured from the establishment of the Inquisition to 1664. The work is marred by partiality and lack of critical ability.

Leger had a noteworthy kindred. His uncle Antoine was pastor at Constantinople and a friend of the patriarch Cyril Lukar, later becoming pastor in the Waldensian valleys, whence he fled to Geneva and was appointed French and Italian preacher and professor of theology. Two cousins of Jean Leger were also preachers. (E. Comba †.)

Bibliography: E. Benoit, *Hist. de l'édit de Nantes*, vol. iii., Delft, 1693; A. Muston, *L'Israël des Alpes*, vols. ii., iv., Paris, 1851; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, viii. 84–88; and the literature dealing with the Waldenses.

LEGGE, AUGUSTUS: Bishop of Lichfield; b. at Sandwell Hall, Staffordshire, Nov. 28, 1839. He studied at Christ Church, Oxford (B.A., 1861), was ordered deacon in 1864, and ordained priest in the following year. He was curate of Handsworth, Staffordshire, 1864–66, and of St. Mary's, Bryanston Square, London, 1866–67; vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Sydenham, 1867–79, and of Lewisham 1879–91. In 1891 he was consecrated bishop of Lichfield. He was chaplain to the bishop of Rochester and honorary canon of the same diocese 1877–91, proctor of the diocese of Rochester 1885–1891, rural dean of Greenwich 1880–86 and of Lewisham 1886–91. In theology he is a liberal churchman, and has written *In Covenant with God* (a book of instruction on confirmation; London, 1891).

LEGGE, JAMES: English Congregationalist; b. at Huntly (34 m. n.w. of Aberdeen), Aberdeenshire, Scotland, Dec. 20, 1815; d. at Oxford Nov. 29, 1897. He studied at King's College, Aberdeen (M.A., 1835), and the Highbury Theological College, London, and from 1839 to 1842 was a missionary of the London Missionary Society at Malacca, where he was appointed principal of the Anglo-Chinese College in 1840. From 1843 to 1873 he was pastor of the Union Church at Hongkong and head of the theological seminary of the London Missionary Society at that place, the successor of the Malacca Anglo-Chinese College. In 1873 he returned permanently to Great Britain. From 1876 he was professor of Chinese at Oxford. He was the author of many works in Chinese, and also published or translated: *The Notions of the Chinese Concerning God and Spirits* (Hongkong, 1852); *Chinese Classics* (5 vols., 1861–72); *Life and Teachings of Confucius* (London, 1867); *The Life and Teaching of Mencius* (1875); *The Book of Ancient Chinese Poetry in English Verse* (1876); *The Texts of Confucianism* (4 vols., Oxford, 1879–82); *The Religions of China: Confucianism and Tâoism described and compared with Christianity* (London, 1880); *The Texts of Tâoism* (2 vols., Oxford, 1886); *Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms: Travels of the Buddhist Pilgrim Fa-hsien in India* (London, 1886); and *The Nestorian Monument of Hsî-an Fû in Shen-Hsî, China, relating to the Diffusion of Christianity in China in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries* (1888).

Bibliography: *DNB*, Supplement, iii. 87–88, where references to other literature may be found.

LEGION, THE THUNDERING. See MARCUS AURELIUS.

LEHNIN PROPHECY: A poem in 100 leonine verses, preserved in manuscript in Berlin, Breslau, Dresden, Göttingen, Greifswald, and elsewhere, prophesying the fortunes of the House of Brandenburg until after 1700. It is ascribed to a monk named Herman, who is said to have lived in the Cistercian abbey of Lehnin (14 m. w.s.w. of Potsdam) in the thirteenth or fourteenth century; but the post-medieval Latinity and the content of the poem forbid its attribution to either Herman II. (1257–72) or Herman III. (1335–42), both of whom were abbots of the monastery. The prophecy begins with a lament on the early fall of the Askanian dynasty, touches briefly on the Wittelsbachs and Luxemburgs ruling Brandenburg, recounts the transfer of power to the burgraves of Nuremberg, sketches briefly the first four of the Hohenzollerns, and then pauses to express hostility to the favor shown Lutheran doctrines by Joachim I. and to the secularization of Lehnin by Joachim II. The five following electors are also clearly indicated, but here the author loses sure historic ground. Frederick I. does not win a crown; Frederick William I. resolves to enter a monastery; and Frederick the Great is drowned after a reign of misfortune. The Hohenzollern line ends with Frederick William III., when Germany receives a Roman Catholic sovereign.

The poem's hostility to Prussia and its ultramontanism are self-evident, but its authorship is still a problem. It has been assigned to at least six: an unknown monk or priest between 1688 and 1700; Andreas Fromm (d. 1685), Lutheran abbot at Cologne-on-the-Spree, but deprived of office in 1666 because of hostility to the Reformed Church, and a convert to Roman Catholicism at Prague in 1668; Friedrich Seidel (d. 1693), councilor of the supreme court of judicature and consistorial assessor at Berlin; the adventurer and catholicizing pseudoprophet Oelzen (d. 1725); the Jesuit F. Wolf, chaplain, for a time, of the Austrian embassy at Berlin during the last years of the great elector (1685–86); and the Roman Catholic convert Nikolaus von Zitzewitz, abbot of Huysberg, near Halberstadt (1692–1704). Even after the spurious nature of the Lehnin prophecy was known, it was repeatedly used in anti-Prussian polemics. Thus, in the crisis of Prussia after the disasters of Jena and Auerstädt, the speedy fall of the Hohenzollerns was proclaimed in various anonymous pamphlets based on this document; and in like manner the period immediately preceding and following the Revolution of 1848 called forth an abundance of literature of similar character. (O. ZÖCKLER †.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *edition princeps* was published in *Das gelehrte Preussen*, vol. ii., Thorn, 1722; an edition in Lat. and Germ. appeared, Regensburg, 1873. For the literature on it consult E. W. Sabell, *Die Literatur der . . . lehninschen Weissagung*, Heilbronn, 1879, and *British Museum Catalogue*, "Hermannus, Abbot of Lehnin." Consult also: B. Schmidt, *Die Weissagung des . . . Hermann von Lehnin*, Berlin, 1820; C. L. Gieseler, *Die lehninsche Weissagung*, Erfurt, 1849; O. Wolff, *Die berühmte lehninsche Weissagung*, Grünberg, 1850; A. Hilgenfeld, *Die lehninsche Weissagung über die Mark Brandenburg*, Leipsic, 1875; J. Schrammen, *Des . . . Hermanns aus Lehnin Prophezeiung*, Cologne, 1887; Hermens, *Kloster Lehnin und seine Weissagung*, Barmen, 1888.

LEIBNITZ, laib′nits.

Early Life and Works (§ 1).
Metaphysical Doctrine (§ 2).
Religious Views (§ 3).
Efforts for Church Union (§ 4).

1. Early Life and Works.

Gottfried Wilhelm (after 1709 Freiherr von) Leibnitz, one of the most distinguished of German philosophers, was born at Leipsic July 1, 1646, and died at Hanover Nov. 14, 1716. After studying jurisprudence, mathematics, and philosophy at Leipsic and Jena, he entered the service of the elector of Mainz in 1666, in which he held various positions, being occupied chiefly with jurisprudence. In 1672 he went to Paris, ostensibly as tutor to Baron von Boyneburg's sons, but his real purpose was to divert the attention of Louis XIV. from plans against Germany. After a visit to London he settled in Paris till 1676, occupying himself principally with mathematics and natural science. His great mathematical discovery, the differential calculus, dates back to 1676, though it was not published till 1684. In 1676 he accepted an offer from the Duke of Brunswick to settle at Hanover as librarian and historiographer. Here he resided during the remainder of his life. Charged with writing the history of the house of Brunswick, he made various journeys in Germany and Italy and gathered an immense amount of material. The fruits of these labors were, *Codex juris gentium diplomaticus* (2 vols., Hanover, 1693–1700), *Accessiones historicæ* (2 vols., 1698–1700), *Scriptores rerum Brunsvicensium* (3 vols., 1701–11), and the unfinished *Annales imperii occidentis Brunsvicenses* (ed. G. H. Perz, 3 vols., 1843–46). Along with these historical studies he wrote a large number of mathematical, philosophical, and theological treatises, published mostly in *Acta eruditorum, Journal des Savants*, and *Miscellanea Berolinensia*. He also carried on extensive etymological investigations and published *Collectanea etymologica* (1717).

2. Metaphysical Doctrine.

It was through Leibnitz that German philosophy first came into its own. The starting-point of his speculations was the conviction that the world is not to be explained in the last analysis as a mechanism. Things in nature do not act upon one another through the mediation of some external force, but are ultimately self-determining. Reality is spiritual, and consists of a plurality of simple, independent monads, whose activities and relations to one another were predetermined by the wisdom of God. To use his form of expression, the monads have no windows through which they may receive external impressions. On the contrary, each monad, as a psychical entity, and center of intellectual activity, is a mirror of the universe. The human body is an aggregate of monads; the soul is the dominating central monad. God is the *monad monadum*. By regarding ultimate reality as entirely spiritual in essence, Leibnitz overcame the difficulty of Descartes' dualism, involving the relation of mind to body; and for the cumbersome *concursus dei* he substituted his famous doctrine of preestablished harmony. From his view-point development, or evolution, becomes a progressive growth of what already existed in embryo. There is nothing radically evil; and moral life is gradually advancing toward perfection. At all times the same reason dominates this process, but it too is caught up in this process of development. In this historical process nothing is lost. The present is "laden with the past and pregnant with the future" (cf. also IDEALISM, II., § 2). Leibnitz left no single work that adequately presents his philosophy. The best exposition of the monadology is a mere summary which he prepared for Prince Eugene of Savoy in 1714. His largest philosophical work was the *Nouveaux essais sur l'entendement humain* (ed. R. E. Raspe, in *Œuvres philosophiques*, Amsterdam, 1765; Eng. transl., *New Essays concerning Human Understanding*, New York, 1896), which was written against Locke in 1704, but not published, owing to Locke's death.

3. Religious Views.

The same intellectualism which Leibnitz exhibits in his metaphysical doctrine also dominates his religious views. While the core of all religion is love toward God, this must be reached by a process of cognition. For Leibnitz religion is not a matter of feeling but of the intellect; though it may be added that his desire for the immediate presence of God in the soul often brings him close to mysticism. He expressed himself frequently on religious questions, but his principal religious work is the *Théodicée* (a word coined by Leibnitz himself), which is an attempt to demonstrate the agreement of reason with faith. The full title is, *Essais de théodicée sur la bonté de Dieu, la liberté de l'homme et l'origine du mal* (2 vols., Amsterdam, 1710). The work originated as a polemic against Bayle's dictionary and was occasioned by the request of Queen Sophia Charlotte. In many ways it reflects the author's metaphysical doctrines, his optimism, and determinism. His doctrine, that this world is the best world which could possibly exist, leads him to a conception of evil which is essentially different from that held by the religious consciousness. Evil is to his mind the simple and natural result of the necessary limitation of every thing created: it is consequently something metaphysical, and not ethical. He does not reduce evil to the status of mere appearance, but seeks to prove that the world is better with evil in it that it would be without it. The world can not be rationally condemned on the basis of the very small portion of it actually known to us. It is to be viewed as an intelligent whole. Just as the astronomer, by taking the sun as his view-point, brought forth a beautiful solar system out of chaos, so the philosopher of the universe will transform it into a kingdom of reason, as soon as he learns "to put his eye in the sun." In a similar way, his doctrine of preestablished harmony leads him into a kind of determinism, in which the freedom of the will becomes lost in the metaphysical necessity, or at least loses its true ethical point. In general he considers Christianity only as the purest and noblest of all religions, as the religion of the wise made by Christ the religion of all, as the natural religion raised by Christ into a law. Nevertheless the book is written with great vigor and warmth, nor did it fail to make a wide and deep impression.

4. Efforts for Church Union.

Another interesting side of Leibnitz's theological activity is his participation in the endeavors then made for the purpose of uniting the different Christian denominations. The general feeling prevalent after the end of the Thirty Years' War was favorable to such plans; and the subject was ably broached by Bossuet's *Exposition de la doctrine de l'église catholique* (Paris, 1671), a defense of the Church of Rome, but conciliatory in its spirit, and very guarded in its expressions. Rojas de Spinola, a Franciscan monk of Spanish descent, and confessor to the Emperor Leopold, was a zealous champion of the project. He visited Hanover several times, at the instance of the emperor; and, as Duke Ernest August was willing to enter into negotiations, a conference was arranged between Rojas de Spinola on the one side, and Molanus and Leibnitz on the other. The results of the conference were received with great hopes, both in Hanover, and in Vienna and Rome. About 1686–90 Leibnitz outlined his plan of church-union in what is known as *Systema theologicum* (Paris, 1819; Eng. transl., *A System of Theology*, London, 1850), which was really a philosophical defense of Roman Catholicism. In 1691 he entered upon a long correspondence with Bossuet; but ultimately the authority of the Council of Trent, absolutely insisted upon by Bossuet, and absolutely rejected by Leibnitz, proved the rock on which all the plans and negotiations for a union between Romanism and Protestantism were wrecked. In the attempts of the courts of Berlin and Hanover to unite the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches, Leibnitz also took a prominent part. The agitation for union was begun in 1696, and in 1698 a conference was held at Hanover between the Prussian court-preacher Jablonski, on the one side, and Leibnitz and Molanus on the other. The plan for union was effected in outline, and the common name "Evangelical" was adopted; but political changes now caused the ardor of the statesmen to cool. In 1703 Frederick I. of Prussia took a further step by establishing at Berlin a Collegium Irenicum, consisting of Lutheran and Reformed theologians; but gradually interest in the plan died out, and Leibnitz himself withdrew from it. Toward the close of his life he became involved in a controversy with Samuel Clarke (see CLARKE, SAMUEL, 4), who published the correspondence between them (London, 1717).

At present there is no complete edition of the works of Leibnitz, though an edition is in course of preparation under the auspices of the International Association of Sciences. The best collected editions are those of L. Dutens (6 vols., Geneva, 1768), G. H. Pertz (12 vols., Hanover, 1843–63), and the unfinished edition by O. Klopp (1864–84). The philosophical works have been edited by J. E. Erdmann (2 vols., Berlin, 1839–40), by P. Janet (2 vols., Paris, 1866), and by C. J. Gerhardt (7 vols., Berlin, 1875–90). Editions in English are, *The Philosophical Works of Leibnitz . . . Translated . . . with Notes by G. M. Duncan* (New Haven, 1890); and *The Monadology and Other Philosophical Writings, Translated with Introduction and Notes by R. Latta* (Oxford, 1898).

(Rudolf Eucken.)

Bibliography: Data regarding the editions and translations of Leibnitz and an extensive list of works concerning him are in J. M. Baldwin, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, iii. 1, pp. 330–338. Materials for a life are found in his letters, the various collections of which are noted in Baldwin, ut sup., pp. 331–332. Lives and sketches of his life have been written by B. de Fontenelle, Paris, 1716 (used the biographical notices of J. G. von Eckhart, Leibnitz's secretary); G. E. Guhrauer, 2 vols., Breslau, 1846 (perhaps the best; on the basis of this was written the *Life* by J. M. Mackie, Boston, 1845); L. Grote, Hanover, 1869; E. Pfleiderer, Leipsic, 1870; E. Bodemann, Hanover, 1876; F. Kirchner, Cöthen, 1877; J. T. Merz, London, 1901; *ADB*, xviii. 172–209; and the accounts in the works on the hist. of philosophy by Windelband, Erdmann, and Ueberweg, especially in that of K. Fischer, *Geschichte der neuern Philosophie*, Heidelberg, 1902.

Discussions of his philosophy or of phases of it are: C. Secrétan, *La Philosophie de Leibnitz*, Lausanne, 1840; L. Feuerbach, *Geschichte der neuern Philosophie*, Ansbach, 1844; A. Helfferich, *Spinoza und Leibnitz, oder das Wesen des Idealismus und des Realismus*, Berlin, 1846; R. Zimmermann, *Leibniz's Monadologie*, Vienna, 1847; J. F. Nourisson, *La Philosophie de Leibnitz*, Paris, 1860; A. Pichler, *Die Theologie des Leibnitz*, 2 vols., Munich, 1869–1870; C. H. Plath, *Leibnitz's Missionsgedanken*, Berlin, 1869; G. Class, *Die metaphysischen Voraussetzungen des leibnizischen Determinismus*, Tübingen, 1874; E. Segond, *La Monadologie*, Paris, 1883; J. Dewey, *Leibnitz's New Essays concerning the Human Understanding*, Chicago, 1888; B. R. Martin, *Leibniz's Ethik*, Erlangen, 1889; H. F. Beneke, *Leibniz als Ethiker*, Erlangen, 1891; E. Dillmann, *Eine neue Darstellung der leibnizischen Monadenlehre*, Leipsic, 1891; P. Gesche, *Die Ethik Leibniz's*, Halle, 1891; F. G. F. Wernigk, *Der Begriff der Materie bei Leibniz*, Jena, 1893; A. Niethack, *Leibniz' Lehre von der menschlichen Wahlfreiheit*, Halle, 1894; B. Russell, *Critical Exposition of the Philosophy of Leibnitz*, Cambridge, 1900; E. Cassirer, *Leibnitz' System in seinen wissenschaftlichen Grundlagen*, Marburg, 1902.

LEIGH, lî, **EDWARD:** English Puritan; b. at Shawell (15 m. s. of Leicester), Leicestershire, Mar. 24, 1602; d. at Rushall (15 m. s.s.e. of Stafford), Staffordshire, June 2, 1671. He studied at Magdalen Hall, Oxford (B.A., 1620; M.A., 1623), and afterward studied law at the Middle Temple. In 1640 he was elected a member of Parliament for Staffordshire, but was expelled for voting for the king in Dec., 1648. His reputation rests upon two compilations, *Critica sacra . . . Observations upon all the Greek Words of the New Testament* (London, 1639), and *Critica sacra. Observations on all the Radices or Primitive Hebrew Words of the Old Testament* (1642). Both works were published together as a third edition in 1650 (4th ed., 1662; Lat. transl., Amsterdam, 1696). Other works are: *A Treatise of Divinity* (London, 1647); *Annotations upon all the New Testament* (1650; Latin transl., Leipsic, 1732); *A System or Body of Divinity* (1654); *A Treatise of Religion and Learning, and of Religious and Learned Men* (1656).

Bibliography: A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, iii. 926–931, 4 vols., London, 1813–20; John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, iii. 164–166, 9 vols., London, 1812–15; *DNB*, xxxii. 432–433.

LEIGH, SAMUEL. See Methodists, II., § 1.

LEIGHTON, lê′tʊn, **ROBERT:** Archbishop of Glasgow; b. (probably in London) 1611; d. in London June 25, 1684. His father, Alexander Leighton, a Presbyterian clergyman and physician who was cruelly persecuted by the Star Chamber, sent him to the University of Edinburgh (M.A., 1631), and afterward to travel on the continent. He spent several years in France, where he was strongly attracted to the Jansenists. On his return to Scotland, in 1641, he was licensed by the presbytery of Edinburgh, and on Dec. 16, 1641, was ordained and inducted into the parish of Newbattle. In 1652 he was sent to London by the Synod of Lothian to negotiate the liberation of the Scottish ministers imprisoned there. Finding himself out of sympathy with the political zeal of his colleagues he resigned his charge in 1652, and in 1653 became principal and professor of divinity at the University of Edinburgh. This post he retained till the Restoration. When episcopacy was established in Scotland in 1661 he remained in the reconstituted church, became bishop of Dunblane, and was consecrated with Sharp and two others, in Westminster Abbey, Dec. 15, 1661. With two or three exceptions all the clergy in his diocese conformed. In other dioceses many clergymen refused to conform, and the persecution began. Leighton pleaded with Charles II. for milder measures, and in 1669 got the first Indulgence. In 1670, Archbishop Burnet having been deprived for opposing this clemency, Leighton was made archbishop of Glasgow, accepting the position on condition that he should be assisted in his efforts to secure the comprehension of the Presbyterians. Failing to get the support of his colleagues he retired from the archbishopric in 1674, and, after a short residence at Edinburgh, went to live with his sister at Broadhurst in Horsted Keynes, Sussex.

Leighton published nothing during his lifetime, and requested that his papers should be destroyed. His writings were first edited by his friend Dr. James Fall. The principal are: *Sermons* (London, 1692); *A Practical Commentary upon the . . . First Epistle General of St. Peter* (part i., York, 1693; part ii., London, 1694); *Prelectiones theologicæ* (London, 1693); and *Three Posthumous Tracts* (1708), including the well-known *Rules and Instructions for a Holy Life* (new ed., Oxford, 1905). There are several more or less complete collected editions of his works, the best that of W. West (vols. ii.–vii., London, 1869–75; vol. i. was never published).

Bibliography: Lives were prefixed to the editions of his works by J. N. Pearson, London, 1825, and J. Aikman, Edinburgh, 1839. Consult also: T. Murray, *Life of R. Leighton*, Edinburgh, 1828; C. F. Secretan, *The Troubled Times and Holy Life of Archbishop Leighton*, London, 1866; W. Blair, *Selections from the Writings of Archbishop Leighton, with Memoir and Notes*, London, 1883; idem, *Short Biography of Archbishop Leighton, with Selections*, ib. 1884; G. Burnet, *Hist. of my own Times*, ed. O. Airy, i. 239 sqq., Oxford, 1900 (authoritative); D. Butler, *Life and Letters of Robert Leighton*, London, 1903; *DNB*, xxxiii. 4–7.

LEIPSIC, COLLOQUY OF: A conference between German Lutherans and Calvinists held in connection with a convention of Protestants of the empire at Leipsic in Feb.–Mar., 1631, called for the purpose of securing united action to prevent the execution of the Edict of Restitution (see Westphalia, Peace of). The elector of Brandenburg was accompanied by his court preacher, Johannes Bergius; and the landgrave of Hesse by his court preacher, Theophilus Neuberger, and Professor Johannes Crocius. These theologians, who belonged to the Reformed faith, invited certain Lutherans of Saxony, Matthias Hoë von Hoënegg, Polycarp Leyser, and the court preacher Heinrich Höpffner to a colloquy on the points of difference between them. It began Mar. 3, and continued till Mar. 23, the Augsburg Confession being taken as basis. An agreement was soon reached with respect to articles i.–ii., v.–ix., xi.–xxviii. The third article, on Christology, proved more difficult; the Lutherans upheld the *Communicatio Idiomatum* (q.v.) which the Reformed denied, and it was finally decided to attempt no more than a definite statement of points of agreement and difference. In regard to the fourth article the Reformed declared that they taught the universality of the divine will of salvation. The tenth article, on the Lord's Supper, occasioned the same difficulties as the third, and was passed in the same way, since an actual agreement was impossible. The Reformed hoped for an agreement in order to oppose Romanism more effectively, but the Lutherans dreaded to make concessions. After the Augsburg Confession had been discussed, it was felt that not all disputes had been settled, and the doctrine of predestination was specially debated. Here again a divergence was revealed, as the theologians of Brandenburg and Hesse upheld the election of a limited number and excluded divine foreknowledge from salvation, while the Saxon theologians considered election as conditioned by a faith which God foresaw. The tone of the colloquy was friendly, even in cases where concord could not be attained. As it was private, only four copies of the protocol were made—one for each of the princes, and one for the faculty of Leipsic; but general reports were soon published in Germany, Holland, France, and England. (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: Sources are the protocol, reprinted in *Corpus librorum symbolicorum*, ed. J. C. W. Augusti, pp. 386 sqq., Elberfeld, 1826, and in *Collectio confessionum*, ed. H. A. Niemeyer, pp. 653 sqq., Leipsic, 1840; J. Bergius, *Relation der Privat-Conferenz . . . zu Leipsic, 1631*, Berlin, 1635. Consult: J. K. Seidemann, *Die Leipziger Disputation*, Dresden, 1843 (best, contains documents); C. W. Hering, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Unionsversuche*, i. 327 sqq., Leipsic, 1836; A. G. Rudelbach, *Reformation, Luthertum und Union*, pp. 407 sqq., ib. 1839; Schaff, *Christian Church*, vi. 178 sqq.; and in general the literature on Luther; the Reformation; Hoë von Hoënegg, Matthias.

LEIPSIC, DISPUTATION OF. See Eck, Johann; Luther, Martin.

LEIPSIC INTERIM. See Interim, 3.

LELAND, lel′and, **JOHN:** Name of two divines.

1. English nonconformist divine and polemical writer; b. at Wigan (15 m. w.n.w. of Manchester), Lancashire, Oct. 18, 1691; d. in Dublin Jan. 16, 1766. At an early age he was taken by his father to Dublin and there educated for the ministry. From 1716 till his death he was pastor of a Presbyterian congregation in Dublin. He distinguished himself by his writings against the deists, particularly Tindal, Thomas Morgan, Henry Dodwell, and Bolingbroke. His most important work is *A View of the Principal Deistical Writers that have Appeared in England in the Last and Present Centuries* (2 vols., London, 1754–56; best ed., 1837). This work is still valuable for the facts it gives about deistic writers, though its arguments against deism are now antiquated. Other works are: *The Divine Authority of the Old and New Testament* (2 vols., 1739–40); *A Defence of Christianity* (1740); *The Advantage and Necessity of the Christian Revelation* (2 vols., 1764); and the posthumous *Discourses* (4 vols., 1768–69).

2. American Baptist; b. at Grafton, Mass., May 14, 1754; d. at Cheshire, Mass., Jan. 14, 1841. Converted at twenty, he began at once to preach as an evangelist and soon made his way to Virginia (1775), where he became a leader of the Virginia Baptists in their struggle for liberty of conscience. In 1789 he introduced a resolution which was adopted by the Baptist general association of Virginia to the effect that "slavery is a violent deprivation of the rights of nature, and inconsistent with a republican government," and recommending that Baptists "make use of every legal means to extirpate this horrid evil from the land." In 1788, as a member of the Baptist general committee on religious liberty, he addressed a noble letter to President Washington in which he pointed out the lack of sufficient security for liberty of conscience in the United States' constitution as it was being presented to the States for ratification. Washington responded courteously and sympathetically, and article I. of the present constitution was introduced. He returned to Massachusetts in 1800 and continued active in his ministry almost to the end of his long life. He published *The Rights of Conscience Inalienable* (Richmond, 1793).

A. H. Newman.

Bibliography: 1. The *Discourses*, ut sup., contains a *Life* by the editor, I. Weld. Consult: L. Stephen, *English Thought in the 18th Century*, vol. i., New York, 1881; *DNB*, xxiii. 17–18; *KL*, vii. 1711. 2. A. H. Newman, *Hist. of the Baptist Churches in the United States*, New York, 1898; W. Cathcart, *Baptist Encyclopædia*, Philadelphia, 1883.

LELONG, le-lōn′, **JACQUES:** French bibliographer; b. in Paris Apr. 19, 1665; d. there Aug. 13, 1721. At an early age he was sent to Malta to be educated by the Knights of St. John, but returned to Paris in 1676 and entered the Congregation of the Oratory in 1686. He was librarian of the Oratory of St. Honoré at Paris from 1699 till his death. His principal work is the valuable *Bibliotheca sacra* (2 vols., Paris, 1709; 2d ed., much enlarged, 2 vols., 1723). Enlarged editions were published by C. F. Börner (2 parts, Leipsic, 1709) and A. G. Masch (5 vols., Halle, 1778–90). Other works are: *Supplément à l'histoire des dictionnaires hébreux de Wolfius* (in *Journal des Savants*, Paris, 1707); *Discours historiques sur les principales éditions des Bibles polyglottes* (1713); and *Bibliothèque historique de la France* (1719; augmented by Févret de Fontelle, 5 vols., 1768–78).

Bibliography: The life was written by P. N. Desmoulets and prefixed to his (2nd) edition of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Paris, 1723. Consult *KL*, vii. 1712–14.

LEMAISTRE DE SACY, le-mê′tr de sā″sî′, **LOUIS ISAAC:** Jansenist; b. in Paris Mar. 29, 1613; d. at the Château of Pomponne, in Brie, Jan. 4, 1684. He added to his name "Sacy," or "Soci," an anagram from his Christian name Isaac, and is often referred to under this title. He studied at the College of Beauvais with his uncle, Antoine Arnauld (q.v.), was ordained priest in 1648, and in 1650 became spiritual director of the recluses at Port Royal. During the persecution of the Jansenists he was expelled from the monastery (1661) and on May 13, 1666, he was imprisoned in the Bastile. After his liberation, Oct. 31, 1668, he lived for a time with his cousin, the Marquis of Pomponne, in Brie. Later he went to Paris and returned to Port Royal in 1675. On having to leave the monastery a second time in 1679, he retired to Pomponne, where he spent the rest of his life. He was buried in the church of Port Royal.

Under various pen-names Lemaistre de Sacy was a prolific writer and was particularly successful as a translator, both of verse and prose. He is principally known for his French translations from the Bible. He collaborated with his brother Antoine Lemaistre on his *Nouveau Testament* (2 vols., Amsterdam, 1668), long known as the *Nouveau Testament de Mons*. This work was vehemently attacked by several bishops, condemned by Clement IX., defended by Arnauld and Nicole, and caused a controversy that lasted twenty years. The first instalments of a translation of the entire Bible, which Lemaistre de Sacy had begun while in the Bastile, appeared in 1672. After his death the work was completed by Thomas du Fossé and C. Huré (32 vols., Paris, 1672–1706). See BIBLE VERSIONS, B, VI., § 4. Among other translations of Lemaistre de Sacy are, *Fables de Phèdre* (Paris, 1647); *Comedies de Térence* (1647); *L'Imitation de Jesus-Christ* (1662), which passed through more than 150 editions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult the literature under PORT-ROYAL.

LE MAÎTRE, le mê´tr (**MEISTER, MAISTER**), **JEAN HENRI:** Swiss Protestant; b. at Zurich c. 1690; d. at Küssnacht (7 m. e.n.e. of Lucerne), 1774. He studied theology and philosophy at Zurich, espoused the cause of the Huguenots and became preacher of the French colony of Huguenots in Baireuth. In 1733 he was called to Bückeburg as assistant of Pierre Crégut, the court preacher and director of the Huguenot colony, whom he succeeded in 1738. He rendered valuable service to the gifted counts of Bückeburg, Friedrich Ludwig Karl and Albrecht Wolfgang, the sovereign of Schaumburg-Lippe, by introducing them into the philosophy of Malebranche, Pierre Bayle, Christian Wolff, Spinoza, and others, and by assuming the religious and scientific education of the two sons of Count Albrecht Wolfgang—Wilhelm and Georg. On account of the rigid church discipline which he introduced in the Huguenot colony, after the model of the Reformed Church in France, Le Maître was secretly attacked and slandered, so that about 1747 he left Bückeburg and accepted a call to Erlangen. Later he returned to his native country and acted as preacher at Küssnacht, but his relations with his former pupil, Count Wilhelm, who in 1747 ascended the throne, always remained cordial.

(F. H. BRANDES.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Brandes, in *Die französische Kolonie*, 1895, nos. 10–12; idem, in *Geschichtsblätter des deutschen Hugenottenvereins*, vol. iii. nos. 7–8.

LEMME, LUDWIG: German Protestant; b. at Salzwedel (110 m. s.e. of Bremen), Aug. 8, 1847. He studied philosophy and theology in Berlin 1866–69, was private tutor, and then tutor at Göttingen 1872–74. In 1874 he was ordained, and was then assistant preacher at the cathedral and second inspector of the seminary for canons at Berlin for two years. From 1876 to 1888 he was inspector of the Johanneum at Breslau, and from 1876 until 1881 also privat-docent at the University of Breslau, where he was appointed associate professor in 1881. In 1884 he was called to Bonn as professor of systematic theology, and since 1891 has occupied a similar position in Heidelberg. In theology he maintains a positive position, allied to that of I. A. Dorner and R. Rothe. He has written: *Das Verhältniss der Dogmatik zu Kritik und Auslegung der heiligen Schrift nach Schleiermacher* (Göttingen, 1874); *Die drei grossen Reformationsschriften Luthers vom Jahre 1520* (Gotha, 1875); *Das Evangelium in Böhmen* (1877); *Die religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Dekalogs* (Breslau, 1880); *Die Nächstenliebe* (1881); *Das erste Ermahnungsschreiben des Paulus an den Timotheus* (1882); *Die Sünde wider den heiligen Geist* (1883); *Die Pflege der Einbildungskraft* (1884); *Die Macht des Gebets mit besonderer Beziehung auf Krankenheilung* (Barmen, 1887); *Der Erfolg der Predigt* (1888); *Die Prinzipien der Ritschl'schen Theologie und ihr Wert* (Bonn, 1891); *Grundlage, Ziel und Eigentümlichkeit des theologischen Studiums* (Heidelberg, 1891); *Der Wert des Gebets* (1892); *Das Recht des apostolischen Glaubensbekenntnisses und seine Gegner* (1893); *Die Kirche die Gemeinschaft der Heiligen* (1893); *Heilstatsachen und Glaubenserfahrung* (1894); *Die Freundschaft* (Heilbronn, 1897); *Die Endlosigkeit der Verdammnis und die allgemeine Wiederbringung* (Gross-Lichterfelde, 1899); *Richard Rothes Hundertjahrfeier* (Heidelberg, 1899); *Zeugnisse vom Heil in Jesu Christo* (sermons; 1899); *Der gegenwärtige Stand der Ethik* (Carlsruhe, 1900); *Das Wesen des Christentums und die Zukunftsreligion* (Gross-Lichterfelde, 1901); *Die Busse nach Schrift, Bekenntnis und Erfahrung* (Herborn, 1901); *Religionsgeschichtliche Entwicklung oder göttliche Offenbarung?* (Carlsruhe, 1901); *Christliche Ethik* (2 vols., Gross-Lichterfelde, 1905); *Wer war Jesus?* (Berlin, 1905); and *Theologische Enzyklopädie* (1909).

LENFANT, län″fän′, **JACQUES:** French Protestant; b. at Bazoches (50 m. s.w. of Paris) Apr. 13, 1661; d. at Berlin Aug. 7, 1728. He studied theology at Saumur and Geneva, and in 1684 he became preacher to the French congregation at Heidelberg. In 1688 Elector Frederick of Brandenburg (the first king of Prussia) appointed him pastor of the French church in Berlin, where he labored nearly forty years. He was a member of the supreme consistory and of the committee for the regulation of French emigration, and in 1724 became a member of the academy of sciences in Berlin. He was a prolific writer, but is prominent chiefly as a church historian. His principal works are: *Histoire de la papesse Jeanne* (Amsterdam, 1694); *Histoire du Concile de Constance* (1714; 2d ed., 2 vols., 1727; Eng. transl., 2 vols., London, 1730), the most important of his works; *Histoire du Concile de Pise et de ce qui s'est passé de plus mémorable depuis ce Concile jusqu'au Concile de Constance* (2 vols., Amsterdam, 1724); and *Histoire de la guerre des Hussites et du Concile de Basle* (1731). With Beausobre he wrote *Le Nouveau Testament de notre Seigneur Jesus Christ traduit en françois sur l'original grec, avec des notes litérales* (2 vols., 1718; Eng. transl., in part, London, 1726). Lenfant is the author of the first volume, which contains the four Gospels and a comprehensive introduction. Other writings are: the polemical *Préservatif contre la réunion avec le siège de Rome* (4 vols., Amsterdam, 1723); and *Seize sermons sur divers textes* (1728; Germ. transl., Halle, 1742). Lenfant was also one of the founders of the *Bibliothèque Germanique.* (C. Pfender.)

Bibliography: E. and É. Haag, *La France protestante,* ed. H. L. Bordier, vol. vi., Paris, 1889; Lichtenberger, *ESR,* viii. 130–138.

LE NOURRY, le nū″rī′, **DENIS NICOLAS:** A member of the Benedictine congregation of Saint-Maur and a participant in their learned works; b. at Dieppe in 1647; d. at the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, Paris, Mar. 24, 1724. He was educated by the French Oratorians, and entered the Benedictine order at Jumièges in 1665. He wrote the introduction to Garet's edition of Cassiodorus (2 vols., Rouen, 1679), and collaborated with Duchesne and Bellaise in the edition of Ambrose, which he completed with Du Friche (2 vols., Paris, 1686–90). He edited also the treatise *De mortibus persecutorum* (1710), attempting to prove that it was not written by Lactantius. His chief work, however, was his *Apparatus ad bibliothecam veterum patrum* (2 vols., 1694–97; 2d ed., enlarged, 2 vols., 1703–15), a historical and critical treatment, to the end of the fourth century, of the authors comprised in the *Maxima bibliotheca veterum patrum* (27 vols., Lyons, 1677). (C. Pfender.)

Bibliography: Niceron, *Mémoires,* i. 275–278; J. C. F. Hoefer, *Nouvelle biographie générale,* xxxviii. 680, 46 vols., Paris, 1855–56.

LENT: The forty days' fast preparatory to the celebration of Easter. The name appears in Middle English as Lenten, which goes back to Anglo-Saxon *lencten,* " spring " (cf. German *Lenz*). The Latin name is *Quadragesima,* from the fortieth day before Easter, when it was approximately supposed to begin. By a similar loose calculation, the three preceding Sundays were known as *Septuagesima* (seventieth), *Sexagesima* (sixtieth), and *Quinquagesima* (fiftieth). Traces of the ancient variations in the length of the season still appear in the Roman Catholic practise of beginning from Septuagesima to wear vestments of violet, the Lenten color of mourning, and to omit from the services the *Alleluia* as an ejaculation of joy. For the history and observance of the fast, see Fasting, II.

Bibliography: Bingham, *Origines,* XXI., i (best); E. Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus,* iii., chaps. 18–19, Antwerp, 1737; H. Liemke, *Die Quadragesimalfasten der Kirche,* Paderborn, 1853; J. H. Blunt, *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology,* pp. 407–408, London, 1870; W. E. Addis and T. Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary,* pp. 558–560, ib. 1903; *DCA,* ii. 972–977 (gives early literature).

LENTULUS, EPISTLE OF. See Jesus Christ, Pictures and Images of, I., § 3.

LEO: The name of thirteen popes.

Leo I., called the Great: Pope 440–461. According to the *Liber pontificalis* he was a native of Tuscany. By 431, as a deacon, he occupied a sufficiently important position for Cyril of Alexandria to apply to him in order that Rome's influence should be thrown against the claims of Juvenal of Jerusalem (q.v.) to patriarchal jurisdiction over Palestine—unless this letter is addressed rather to Pope Celestine. About the same time Johannes Cassianus (q.v.) dedicated to him the treatise against Nestorius written at his request. But nothing shows more plainly the confidence felt in him than his being chosen by the emperor to settle the dispute between Aetius and Albinus, the two highest officials in Gaul. During his absence on this mission, Sixtus III. died (Aug. 11, 440), and Leo was unanimously elected by the people to succeed him. On Sept. 29 he entered upon a pontificate which was to be epoch-making for the centralization of the government of the Church.

Zeal for Orthodoxy.

An uncompromising foe of heresy, Leo found that in the diocese of Aquileia, Pelagians were received into church communion without formal repudiation of their errors; he wrote to rebuke this culpable negligence, and required a solemn abjuration before a synod. Manicheans fleeing before the Vandals had come to Rome in 439 and secretly organized there; Leo became aware of this and proceeded against them (c. 443), holding a public debate with their representatives, burning their books, and warning the Roman Christians against them. The edict of Valentinian III. against them (June 19, 445) was brought about by his efforts. Nor was his attitude less decided against the Priscillianists. Bishop Turrubius of Astorga, astonished at the spread of this sect in Spain, had addressed the other Spanish bishops on the subject, sending a copy of his letter to Leo, who did not let slip the opportunity to exercise influence in Spain. He wrote an extended treatise (July 21, 447) against the sect, examining its false teaching in detail, and calling for a Spanish general council to investigate whether it had any adherents in the episcopate—but this was prevented by the political circumstances of Spain.

Leo enforced his authority in 445 against Dioscurus, Cyril's successor in the patriarchate of Alexandria, insisting that the ecclesiastical practise of his see should follow that of Rome, since Mark, the disciple of Peter and founder of the Alexandrian Church, could have had no other tradition than that of the prince of the apostles. The fact that the African province of Mauretania Cæsariensis had been preserved to the empire and thus to the Nicene faith in the Vandal invasion, and in its isolation was disposed to rest on outside support, gave Leo an opportunity to assert his authority there, which he did decisively in regard to a number of questions of discipline. In a letter to the bishops of Campania, Picenum, and Tuscany (443) he required the observance of all his precepts and those of his predecessors; and he sharply rebuked the bishops of Sicily (447) for their deviation from the Roman custom as to the time of baptism, requiring them to send delegates to the Roman synod to learn the proper practise.

The assertion of Roman power over Illyria had been a strong point with previous popes. Innocent I. had constituted the metropolitan of Thessalonica his vicar, in order to oppose the growing power of the patriarch of Constantinople there. But now the Illyrian bishops showed a tendency to side with Constantinople, and the popes had difficulty in maintaining their authority. In 444 Leo laid down in a letter to them the principle that Peter had received the primacy and oversight of the whole Church as a requital of his faith, and that thus all important matters were to be referred to and decided by Rome. In 446 he had occasion twice to interfere in the affairs of Illyria, and in the same spirit spoke of the Roman pontiff as the apex of the hierarchy of bishops, metropolitans, and primates. From the end of the fifth century, however, the influence of Constantinople was again predominant here.

Asserts His Authority in Gaul.

Not without serious opposition did he succeed in asserting his authority over Gaul. Patroclus of Arles (d. 426) had received from Pope Zosimus the recognition of a primacy over the Gallican Church (see ARLES, ARCHBISHOPRIC OF), which was strongly asserted by his successor Hilary (429–449). An appeal from Celidonius of Besançon gave Leo occasion to proceed against Hilary, who defended himself stoutly at Rome, refusing to recognize Leo's judicial status. But Leo restored Celidonius and restricted Hilary to his own diocese, depriving him even of his metropolitan rights over the province of Vienne. Feeling that his dominant idea of the Roman universal monarchy was threatened, Leo appealed to the civil power for support, and obtained from Valentinian III. (q.v.) the famous decree of June 6, 445, which recognized the primacy of the bishop of Rome based on the merits of Peter, the dignity of the city, and the decrees of Nicæa (in their interpolated form); ordained that any opposition to his rulings, which were to have the force of law, should be treated as treason; and provided for the forcible extradition by provincial governors of any one who refused to answer a summons to Rome. Hilary made his submission, although under his successor, Ravennius, Leo divided the metropolitan rights between Arles and Vienne (450).

A favorable occasion for extending the authority of Rome in the East offered in the renewal of the Christological controversy by Eutyches (see EUTYCHIANISM), who in the beginning of the conflict appealed to Leo and took refuge with him on his condemnation by Flavian. But on receiving full information from Flavian, Leo took his side decisively. At the "Robber Synod" of Ephesus Leo's representatives delivered the famous "tome" or statement of the faith of the Roman Church in the form of a letter addressed to Flavian, which repeats, in close adherence to Augustine, the formulas of western Christology, without really touching the problem that was agitating the East. The council did not read the letter, and paid no attention to the protests of Leo's legates, but deposed Flavian and Eusebius, who appealed to Rome. Leo demanded of the emperor that an ecumenical council should be held in Italy, and in the mean time, at a Roman synod in Oct., 449, repudiated all the decisions of the "Robber Synod." Without going into a critical examination of its dogmatic decrees, in his letters to the emperor and others he demanded the deposition of Eutyches as a Manichean and Docetic heretic. With the death of Theodosius II. (450) and the sudden change in the Eastern situation, Anatolius the new patriarch of Constantinople fulfilled Leo's requirements, and his "tome" was everywhere read and recognized. He was now no longer desirous of having a council, especially since it would not be held in Italy. It was called to meet at Nicæa, then transferred to Chalcedon, where his legates held at least an honorary presidency, and where the bishops recognized him as the interpreter of the voice of Peter and as the head of their body, requesting of him the confirmation of their decrees. He firmly declined to confirm their disciplinary arrangements, which seemed to allow Constantinople a practically equal authority with Rome and regarded the civil importance of a city as a determining factor in its ecclesiastical position; but he strongly supported its dogmatic decrees, especially when, after the accession of the Emperor Leo I. (457) there seemed to be a disposition toward compromise with the Eutychians. He succeeded in having an orthodox patriarch, and not the Monophysite Timotheus Ælurus (see MONOPHYSITES, §§ 3 sqq.), chosen as patriarch of Alexandria on the murder of Proterius.

The approaching collapse of the Western Empire gave Leo a further opportunity to appear as the representative of lawful authority. When Attila invaded Italy in 452 and threatened Rome, it was Leo who, with two high civil functionaries, went to meet him, and so impressed him that he withdrew—at least according to Prosper, although Jordanis, who represents Leo's contemporary Priscus, gives other grounds. His intercession could not prevent the sack of the city by Genseric in 455, but murder and arson were repressed by his influence. He died probably on Nov. 10, 461.

Leo's Significance.

The significance of Leo's pontificate lies in the fact of his assertion of the universal episcopate of the Roman bishop, which comes out in his letters, and still more in his ninety-six extant orations. According to him the Church is built upon Peter, in pursuance of the promise of Matt. xvi. 16–19. Peter participates in everything which is Christ's; what the other apostles have in common with him they have through him. The Lord prays for Peter alone when danger threatens all the apostles, because his firmness will strengthen the others. What is true of Peter is true also of his successors. Every other bishop is charged with the care of his own special flock, the Roman with that of the whole Church. Other bishops are only his assistants in this great task. Through the see of Peter, Rome has become the capital of the world in a wider sense than before. For this reason, when the earth was divided among the apostles, Rome was reserved to Peter, that here, at the very center, the decisive triumph might be won over the earthly wisdom of philosophy and the power of the demons; and thus from the head the light of truth streams out through the whole body. In Leo's eyes the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon acquired their validity from his confirmation. The wide range of this theory justifies the application to him of the title of the first pope. (N. Bonwetsch.)

Bibliography: The *Opera* were edited by P. Quesnel, 2 vols., Paris, 1675 (defended Hilary against Leo, therefore put on the Index); and by P. and H. Ballerini, 3 vols., Venice, 1753–57 (contain works of doubtful authenticity), from which they were reprinted in *MPL*, liv.–lvi., with life by Anastasius Bibliothecarius (given with commentary in *MPL*, cxxviii. 299 sqq.) and Quesnel's *Dissertatio.* Fifty selected letters are printed in H. Hurter, *Opuscula sacrorum patrum selecta*, ser. 1, vols., xxv–xxvi., Innsbruck, 1874. An Eng. transl. of selected letters and sermons is given in *NPNF*, 2 ser., vol. xii., together with a life and prolegomena.

Data concerning Leo's life may be sought in: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Mommsen in *MGH*, *Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 101–106; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xv. 414–832 (accurate, impartial); Jaffé, *Regesta*, pp. 34 sqq.; W. A. Arendt, *Leo der Grosse und seine Zeit*, Mainz, 1835 (Roman Catholic, apologetic); E. Perthel, *Leo's I. Leben und Lehren*, Jena, 1843 (Protestant and depreciatory); T. Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, i., book vi., chaps. iv.–vi., London, 1859; F. Böhringer, *Die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen*, vol. xii., Stuttgart, 1879; C. H. Gore, in *Fathers for English Readers*, London, 1880; *DCB*, iii. 652–673 (minute); F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, i. 189–228, London, 1894. Views of his activities are given by P. Kuhn, *Die Christologie Leos I.*, Würzburg, 1894; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, ii. 302–356, 564, Eng. transl., vols. iii.–iv.; O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, pp. 460 sqq., Freiburg, 1901; Harnack, *Dogma*, vols. ii.–v., passim. Consult also, Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, x. 169–275; Bower, *Popes*, i. 189–248; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 253 sqq.; Neander, *Christian Church*, vol. ii., passim; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 314 sqq. et passim.

Leo II.: Pope 682–683. The importance of his brief pontificate lies in his action in confirming the acts of the sixth ecumenical council, which contained the inclusion of his predecessor Honorius among the condemned leaders of Monothelitism (q.v.). Similarly, in sending the acts of the council to the Spanish bishops, he included Honorius as one "who did not, as became his apostolic authority, extinguish the flame of heretical doctrine, but by his negligence fostered it." Macarius of Antioch and his Monothelite friends, who had been sent to Rome, were (according to the *Liber pontificalis*) imprisoned in various monasteries, with the exception of two who recanted. The same authority describes Leo as learned in the Scriptures, Greek, and ecclesiastical music, and as charitable. The date of his burial is July 3, 683. (N. Bonwetsch.)

Bibliography: The *Epistolæ* are in *MPL*, xcvi., cf. *NA*, viii. 363–364. Consult: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Mommsen in *MGH*, *Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 200–202; *ASB*, June, v. 375; R. Baxmann, *Die Politik der Päpste*, i. 185 sqq., Elberfeld, 1868; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, ii. 568 sqq., Bonn, 1885; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xi. 784–785, xii. 955–958; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iii. 287 sqq., Eng. transl., v. 179 sqq.; Bower, *Popes*, i. 486–487; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, ii. 287; *DCB*, iii. 673–674.

Leo III.: Pope 795–816. A Roman by birth, he was elected Dec. 26 and consecrated the next day. His election is said by the *Liber pontificalis* to have been unanimous; but the Roman aristocracy was certainly hostile to him at the start, which drove him to rely on the support of Charlemagne. He sent word of his election to the king, assuring him of his fidelity, and Charlemagne's answer expressed his readiness to renew the alliance between the Frankish kingdom and the Church. At first this relation was useful to Leo, and soon enough was absolutely necessary, owing not only to the danger of Saracen attack but even more to the hostile attitude of Leo's personal opponents in Rome, the men whom his elevation had robbed of their power. At the customary procession on St. Mark's day, 799, he was attacked and maltreated; and a tumultuous gathering judged him on various grave charges and declared him deposed. His partizans rallied and released him in the night. He fled to Germany, where Charlemagne received him as the lawful pope, and in November he was restored by the Frankish power. In Charlemagne's mind, however, the duty of protection involved the right of oversight. His commissioner was directed to make a full investigation as well of the charges against Leo as of the violence of his opponents. Difficulties stood in the way either of judging a pope or of allowing his sacred office to be filled by a man under suspicion of serious misdoing. The suggestion of Leo's voluntary retirement to a monastery was made, but not so easily carried out. Charlemagne decided to take the matter up in person, and appeared in Italy in the autumn of 800. The investigation ended not by a judicial condemnation or by a judicial acquittal, but by Leo's taking a solemn oath in Charlemagne's presence that he was innocent of the charges, after which his opponents were condemned to death as rebels, though the sentence was commuted to banishment. Two days later, on Christmas day, Leo crowned Charlemagne as emperor, apparently (though the question has been much debated) without any preliminary knowledge or desire on the king's part, and to the profit rather of Leo's own importance.

Charlemagne deduced from the new title the conclusion that Rome was to be treated as an integral part of his empire, and thenceforth little essential difference can be observed between its bishop and the other metropolitans of the empire; the pope was considered a subject of the emperor. The extent to which this was carried may be seen from the small part assigned to Leo in the settlement of the controversies of the time. The Adoptionist controversy was taken in hand by Charlemagne himself, and Leo had nothing to do but to repeat at a Roman synod Oct. 23, 798, the condemnation already pronounced in Germany. In the negotiations as to the *Filioque* he ventured, indeed, to dissociate himself from the conclusion of the Frankish Church, but his solemn exposition of the ancient text of the creed, engraved on silver tablets, in St. Peter's made no impression on Charlemagne and his theologians, and the *Filioque* was accepted both in the Frankish Church and tacitly in Rome. Even in his relations with the Greek Church Leo was hampered by his relation to Charlemagne. When the emperor died (Jan. 28, 814), Leo neglected to have the Roman people do homage to his successor Louis the Pious. Thinking to get revenge on his old enemies, he had some of them imprisoned or executed. Louis took notice of this trespass on the imperial rights, and sent his nephew Bernard to investigate it; but Leo succeeded in pacifying him by an embassy. He died June 12, 816. He was a man of small capacity, unduly magnified in later times by the importance attached to his coronation of Charlemagne. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Epistolæ* are in Jaffé, *BRG*, iv. 308–334, and Bouquet, *Recueil*, v. 597–604. Sources are: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii. 1 sqq., Paris, 1892; and the annals collected in *MGH*, *Script.*, i. 1826. Consult: F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, ii. 460–493, London, 1894; J. A. Ketterer, *Karl der Grosse und die Kirche*, Munich, 1898; Hauck, *KD*, ii. passim; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. iii. passim; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xii. 399–401 et passim; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 173–192; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, ii. 454 sqq.; Neander, *Christian Church*, vol. iii. passim; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iv. 455; *DCB*, iii. 674–679; and also much of the literature under CHARLEMAGNE.

Leo IV.: Pope 847–855. He was elected at the end of January and consecrated Apr. 10, without waiting for imperial confirmation, on pretext of danger from the Saracens. For the same reason he zealously pushed the new fortifications of Rome, and thus strengthened the papal independence. The legal relations with the empire were not, however, substantially altered; Leo acknowledged the theoretical supremacy of the emperor in both temporal and spiritual matters, even while he endeavored to efface the recollection of its past exercise. In purely spiritual questions he acted unhesitatingly as the supreme head of Christianity. He showed his conception of his see as " mistress and head of all churches " (Jaffé, *Regesta*, 2647) by refusing his assent to the decrees of the Synod of Soissons (853) and requiring a new one to be held in presence of his legate (see HINCMAR OF REIMS), as well as by reproaching Ignatius of Constantinople for holding a synod and deposing certain bishops without his sanction, and finally summoning both parties to Rome (see PHOTIUS). He died July 17, 855. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Epistolæ et decreta* are in *MPL*, cxv. 655–674, cf. cxxix. 999–1002. Sources for a life are the *Vita* with commentary in *ASB*, July, iv. 302–326; *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii. 106 sqq., Paris, 1892; and the annals collected in *MGH*, *Script.*, i. 1826. Consult: F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iii. 91–111, London, 1895; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xii. 406–409; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 217–220; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 18–20; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iv. 459. Much of the literature cited under GREGORY IV. is pertinent.

Leo V.: Pope 903. He ruled only a month from his consecration in August, was then overthrown and imprisoned, and soon died. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources for a life are: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii. 234, Paris, 1892; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 444; J. M. Watterich, *Romanorum pontificum . . . vitæ*, i. 32, Leipsic, 1862. Consult: F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iii. 242, London, 1895; C. Dümmler, *Auxilius und Bulgarius*, Leipsic, 1866; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xii. 743; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 306; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 155.

Leo VI.: Pope 928–929. He was the son of the Roman *primicerius* Christophorus. All that is known of him is that he was elected in June, 928, and died probably in the following February. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii. 242, Paris, 1892; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 453; J. M. Watterich, *Romanorum pontificum . . . vitæ*, i. 33, Leipsic, 1862. Consult: F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iii. 282; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 311.

Leo VII.: Pope 936–939. He was consecrated early in Jan., 936, presumably the choice of the younger Alberic, then in power. He was a pious monk, allied with the Cluniac movement, and what is known of his papal acts is principally confined to efforts for monastic reform. He died in July, 939. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: His *Epistolæ* are in Bouquet, *Recueil*, vol. ix. Consult: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii. 244, Paris, 1892; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 455–456; J. M. Watterich, *Romanorum pontificum . . . vitæ*, i. 33, Leipsic, 1862; E. Sackur, *Die Cluniacenser*, Halle, 1892; F. Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome*, iii. 306–317, London, 1895; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 312–313; and the literature under JOHN XI.

Leo VIII.: Pope 963–965. He was elected Dec. 4 to replace John XII., who had been deposed by Otto I. For a time he was driven from Rome, but was restored by Otto after John's death, and his new rival, Benedict V., was deposed in June, 964, at a synod held in the emperor's presence (see JOHN XII.; BENEDICT V.). Leo died, however, in the following spring. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii. 250, Paris, 1892; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 467–468; J. M. Watterich, *Romanorum pontificum . . . vitæ*, i. 42–43; A. Ens, *Pythagoras novus excussus*, Liége, 1767; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xii. 831–833; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iii. 348–357, London, 1895; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 319–320; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 183–185; Neander, *Christian Church*, iii. 368; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iv. 290.

Leo IX. (Bruno, son of Count Hugo of Egisheim in Alsace, a cousin of the Emperor Conrad II.): Pope 1048–54. He was born at Egisheim (2 m. w. of Colmar) June 21, 1002, and had already distinguished himself by a model administration as bishop of Toul when, by command of Henry III. and on request of the Roman delegates, he was chosen pope at the diet in Worms early in Dec., 1048, succeeding Damasus II. Talented, energetic, lovable, experienced, and in close touch with the movement for a reform in church life emanating from Cluny (q.v.), he was highly qualified for the office tendered to him. His reception in Rome was brilliant, and, at his own request, he was there again elected and then assumed the pontifical government, being enthroned on Feb. 12, 1049. Hildebrand (see GREGORY VII.), who in 1046 had been obliged to accompany Gregory VI. to Germany, returned to Rome in Leo's retinue, and was now received into the body of cardinals. Of still greater significance was the importation of other forces. The episcopal see of Silva Candida was assigned to the monk Humbert (q.v.); Hugo the White (q.v.) was promoted as cardinal priest of St. Clement in Rome; Stephen of Lorraine obtained an abbot's post in Rome; and Archbishop Frederick, brother of Duke Godfrey of Lorraine, was called from Liége.

Leo held his first Roman synod in the Lateran Apr. 9–12, 1049, and there laid the foundation and outlined the policy of his whole administration. His first attempt at reform aimed to suppress simony. The synod approved the deposition of simoniacal bishops, but, with clamorous protest, refused the pope's demand for the annulment of all ordinations of simonists on the ground of its practical inexpediency. A law was also passed concerning compulsory celibacy in the priesthood, which involved little substantially new but proved of great consequence as it initiated the reformed papacy's warfare against the marriage of priests. Soon afterward, Leo started on a journey to Germany, overtaking the emperor in Saxony, and attending him by way of Cologne to Aix-la-Chapelle. At Reims, Oct. 3–6, he held the great synod which has peculiar interest both by reason of the preceding situation and of its enactments. There was but small attendance from France, and Leo exercised great reserve. The celibacy question did not at this time come up for discussion at all, and the examination of charges in case of the bishops under suspicion of simony was conducted in a lukewarm way. Leo also forbore to press his rigorous conviction in respect to simoniacal consecrations. On the other hand, he pursued all the more energetically his aim of bringing out in clearly expressed terms the authoritative position of the papacy. The archbishop of Santiago in Galicia, northern Spain, had assumed the title *Apostolicus*, and was therefore excommunicated. Many French bishops and abbots who had stayed away from the synod were likewise sentenced with the ban, while others were summoned to Rome. At the close of the synod the first investiture law by the reformed papacy was promulgated (see INVESTITURE). Two weeks later, about Oct. 19, Leo opened, in presence of Emperor Henry III., a brilliant synod at Mainz, which likewise took measures against simony and the marriage of priests. He then returned to Italy.

Leo's Reforms.

In the spring of 1050 Leo was in southern Italy, where he convened a synod at Salerno and at Siponto, southward of Monte Gargano. The Roman synod which met under his presidency on Apr. 29 continued the activity for reform. A few weeks later, however, he was again in southern Italy, where the advance of the Normans was inaugurating new political combinations. The synod at Vercelli then recalled him to the north. This belongs to the conventions under Leo IX. which are of great moment in the history of dogma, for here Berengar of Tours (q.v.) was condemned anew. Here again the difficult question came up as to what course should be observed in the matter of ordinations by simonists, but once again the pope failed to have his policy adopted; namely, that the actual proof of a simoniacal ordination required the revocation of the sacrament thereof. In the autumn Leo journeyed across the Alps once more to France.

Early in 1051 he was present in Germany, and had interviews of political importance with Henry III. at Cologne, Treves, and Augsburg. On returning to Rome, Leo finally resigned his bishopric of Toul. The third of the Roman synods convened by him sat in April, after Easter. Once again the administration of the sacraments by simonists was discussed without any understanding being reached. During the following months all the pope's energy was called forth in southern Italy, where the issue was to meet the dangers of the Norman invasion.

The Norman Invasion.

Leo first attempted, by alliance with Prince Weimar of Salerno and Count Drogo, chief of the Apulian Normans, to secure the acquisition of Benevento by pacific means, but did not succeed. Claims on Benevento could be made effectual by force alone, and to this end the pope sought help from King Henry I. of France and Emperor Henry III. of Germany. Later, in the early summer of 1052, Leo attempted to lead the conflict with the Normans in person, but was unable to keep his army together. In this difficult situation he desired a personal understanding with the German emperor, and being appealed to at this very time by King Andrew of Hungary as mediator in the war with Henry III., he hastened to the imperial camp at Pressburg. Although his intervention brought no advantage to the German empire, and though the Hungarian expedition issued unfavorably, the good understanding between Henry and Leo was not impaired and they returned together to Germany. While pope and emperor were celebrating the Christmas festival together at Worms, they came to the important agreement that Henry ceded Benevento and other imperial tenure in southern Italy to the pope, in return for which Leo renounced the rights of the Roman Church to a number of foundations and cloisters in Germany (the bishopric of Bamberg, abbey of Fulda, etc.). The value of this bargain for Leo, however, depended on whether the German emperor would also vouchsafe him the help of the empire to maintain these territories against the Normans. At the outset Henry intended this, but Bishop Gebhard of Eichstädt brought it about that the army, already started on its march to Italy, was recalled. Nevertheless a good many German troops, especially from Swabia, were in the pope's train when he returned to Italy in Feb., 1053.

Leo's time of successes was past. When he convened the Lombard episcopate, which had proved far from responsive to his reforming efforts, in synod at Mantua on Feb. 24, 1053, turbulent scenes ensued rendering all business impossible and even menacing the pope's life. After the (fourth) Roman Easter synod, in April, Leo made preparation for a decisive blow at the Normans. The battle at Civitate in Norman Apulia, June 18, brought the decision—the papal army was almost annihilated, and Leo himself fell into the hands of the enemy. He was detained nearly nine months at Benevento as captive of war, but without being subjected to restrictions of open communication. Unbroken by his misfortune he urged the Eastern Empire and Germany to a great action against the Normans, but did not achieve his object. Upon his falling dangerously ill, he was allowed to return to Rome. He left Benevento on Mar. 12, and died at Rome on Apr. 19, 1054.

The pontificate of Leo IX. covers few years, but in this brief span of time he managed to win a position of commanding respect for the Roman primate in western Christendom, indicated new and universal tasks for the same, and by adoption of the

Leo's Achievements.

pseudo-Isidorian code (see Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals) in the practical life of the Church, paved the way for the later supreme domination of the papacy under Gregory VII. His extensive journeys were a well-chosen means of coming into personal contact with the various parts of the Church; and his plan of combining with his visits church consecrations and translations, in so far as these festivals afforded opportunity for the vast multitude to see the head of the Church, not only enhanced the popularity of Leo himself, but likewise the prestige of the papacy as an institution. Of no smaller significance was the revival and further development of church synods. Under Leo the synods again became vehicles and centers of ecclesiastical life, at the same time proving an available arm for strengthening, or at least reviving, the connection between the episcopate and Peter's throne. This result was also effected through the manifold honors which Leo was wont to bestow on occasion of his journeys; and no less so by his manner of having himself escorted by devoted prelates, such as Archbishop Halinard of Lyons, Archbishop Hugo of Besançon, and Abbot Hugo of Cluny. There can be no doubt that these measures were part of a systematic policy on the part of the pope. Nevertheless this tendency toward centralization of the church life had no disquieting effect upon Leo's contemporaries, as it was associated with an energetic procedure against the vice of simony and the custom of sacerdotal marriage, wherein the circle of the Cluny reform party discerned the greatest perils to the life of the Church. When Leo ascended the throne, he was the trusted advocate of this group, and he thoroughly fulfilled the hopes that were entertained of him from that quarter. There could be no question, again, of a real jeopardizing of the independence of the episcopate under Leo IX., or of an aggressive movement against the temporal State, although some attempts in this direction and the germs of complications may be remarked; but they did not, as yet, mature, nor was the situation with reference to Henry III. clouded by the recognition of a fundamental antagonism. It is true that Leo's achievements are offset by too decided attention to Italian territorial politics, and by the initiation of the great schism of the Eastern Church (see Cærularius, Michael; Eastern Church, II., § 4). However, it must not be overlooked that this catastrophe was the culmination of developments embracing hundreds of years; and in so far as the personalities then on the stage can be made accountable for the same at all, it is not so much Leo IX. who incurs the burden of blame as his representatives. Carl Mirbt.

Bibliography: For the *Epistolæ, diplomata et decreta* consult: *MPL*, cxliii.; *MGH*, *Epist.*, iii (1883), 261–728; *NA*, iv. 192–195; Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 529–549, ii. 749; *Tabularium Casinense*, i. 378 sqq., Monte Casino, 1887; P. Kehr, *Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 1898, part i, p. 311, 1899, part i. pp. 216–218, 1900, part ii. 142–146, part iii. 309–310, 1901, part i. pp. 83–84. Bibliographies are found in F. Cerroti, *Bibliografia di Roma medievale e moderna*, i. 353 sqq., Rome, 1893; U. Chevalier, *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge*, p. 1373, and *Supplément*, p. 2708, Paris, 1877-1888.

An early anonymous *Vita* is reproduced in S. Borgia, *Memorie istoriche della pontificia*, ii. 299–348, Rome, 1764. Other lives, including those by Bruno and Guibert, with accounts of his death and miracles, are found in *MPL*, cxliii. 465–548, clxv. 1109–1122, and in *ASB*, April, ii. 642–674. A Germ. transl. of Guibert was issued by P. P. Brucker, Strasburg, 1902; cf. J. May, *Zur Kritik mittelalterlicher Geschichtsquellen*, Offenburg, 1889. Modern lives are: L. Spach, Strasburg, 1864; O. Delarc, Paris, 1876; L. Winterer, Rixheim, 1886; W. Martens, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1894; *KL*, vii. 1787–95. On the place of his birth consult: Fischer, *Recherches sur le lieu de la naissance du . . . Léon IX.*, Nantes, 1873; P. P. Dexen, *Oú est né . . . Leon IX.*, Strasburg, 1884; L. G. Glöckler, *Geburtsort des . . . Leo IX.*, ib. 1892. Further material on the general subject will be found in C. Will, *Die Anfänge der Restauration der Kirche im 11. Jahrhundert*, Marburg, 1859; L. Duhamel, *Léon IX. et les monastères de Lorraine*, Épinal, 1869; R. Baxmann, *Die Politik der Päpste*, ii. 213 sqq., Elberfeld, 1869; J. Hergenröther, *Photius*, iii. 735 sqq., Regensburg, 1869; W. Martens, *Die Besetzung des päpstlichen Stuhles unter . . . Heinrich III. und IV.*, pp. 25 sqq., Freiburg, 1887; W. Bröcking, *Die französische Politik Papst Leos IX.*, Stuttgart, 1891; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, iii. 445–485, Bonn, 1892; C. Mirbt, *Die Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregor XII.*, Leipsic, 1894; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome*, iv. 74–90, London, 1896; H. Gerdes, *Geschichte der salischen Kaiser und ihrer Zeit*, pp. 100–111, Leipsic, 1898; J. von Pflugk-Harttung, *Die Bullen der Päpste*, pp. 160 sqq., Gotha, 1901; J. Drehmann, *Papst Leo IX. und die Simonie*, Leipsic, 1908; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xiii. 199–214; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iv. 716 sqq.; Neander, *Christian Church*, iii. 378–386; Moeller, *Christian Church*, ii. 229–230; Bower, *Popes*, ii. 343–361; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 240–283; and the literature under Berengar; Gregory XII.

Leo X. (Giovanni de' Medici, second son of Lorenzo the Magnificent): Pope 1513–21. He was born in Florence Dec. 11, 1475, and was destined by his father for the spiritual career with the intent that he should eventually attain to the highest office in the Church. This was anticipated in 1489 when Innocent VIII. on Lorenzo's motion nominated the lad of fourteen cardinal *in petto*. Four years later, when Giovanni's humanistic education, directed by Angelo Poliziano, Marsilio Ficino, Pico della Mirandola, and the author (subsequently Cardinal Bibbiena) of the immoral play *Il Cortigiano*, was completed, and after a supplementary course of theology and canon law at Pisa, he put on the cardinal's insignia, and became occupied in affairs of the Curia. He also took part in the conclave which, very much against his wish, chose Alexander VI. to succeed Innocent VIII. after the unexpected death of the latter in 1492. Rome had now little attraction for Giovanni and he scarcely visited the city until 1500, spending his time in Venice, Germany, and Flanders. His ascendency with the Curia did not set in till the time of Julius II., in 1503, when the pope's eagerness to aggrandize his family ran parallel with like interests of the Medici, and on both sides a comprehensive culture of humanistic and artistic endeavors appeared as a matter of course. The Medicean cardinal gained important political influence in 1509, when appointed governor in Bologna, though this was ended by the defeat of the papal power at Ravenna Apr. 11, 1512, when the governor himself was captured. While being transported to Milan, however, he escaped the French and reached Florence, where the pope also was present.

When Julius II. died in the early part of 1513, after a brief conclave Giovanni was elected. His family now stood doubly high, since in Florence, too, the leader of a conspiracy against them had just been seized and executed. In Rome the election was hailed with jubilation. The "Holy" League against France was concluded by Henry VII. of England with Ferdinand the Catholic and Maximilian Sforza, though Leo X. had as little part in it as in the matter of accepting an offer of alliance with Louis XI. of France. The defeat of the French at Novara, however, in June, 1513, served the pope's cause. Meanwhile the Fifth Lateran Council was in session at Rome; this was to institute "reform," and it has been affirmed by some later Roman Catholic historians, conceding the corrupt state of contemporary church affairs, that even without Luther, and better than he, the council would have attained this object, had it only been allowed complete operation. But there was no suggestion of thoroughgoing reform; the sole consequence of weight, and that important only for the Curia, was the fact that the schismatic Council of Pisa (see Julius II.) suffered its deathblow, in that the leaders of the schismatic prelates submitted to the Curia. At the eighth and ninth session, the reform question was treated, and certain amendments in respect to the filling of ecclesiastical offices were introduced; there were also some further ameliorations in particular points; but touching what constituted the very fulcrum of the Lutheran Reformation, that is, a religious renewal and quickening, there was no discussion whatever—at the utmost, a speaker here and there suggested the necessity and manner of laboring toward that end.

After the dark clouds of the political situation had been dispelled, Leo X. felt himself at the summit of his power; the Turks were to be actively resisted, funds for a crusade were to be collected, and a fleet made ready. While he was planning all this, likewise collecting money for continuation of the building of St. Peter's and other objects, an event occurred in Germany which was to shake the position and power of the papacy most profoundly—the beginning of the Reformation. Undoubtedy Leo X. against his will promoted its progress, because he failed to understand its nature and aim; and that he did not understand is explained by the fact that his whole interest was directed upon other matters than the question as to how religious life could be reawakened. He did not discern that the Reformation was ushering in a new era, and his bull of excommunication against Luther (1520), as well as his cooperation in the Edict of Worms (1521) were vain attempts to retard the movement. Leo died in Rome, Dec. 1, 1521. K. Benrath.

Bibliography: Sources are: P. Bembo, *Epistolæ . . . quarum libri 16 Leonis X. . . . nomine scripti sunt*, Basel, 1539; *Leonis X. regesta*, ed. J. Hergenröther, 8 parts, Freiburg, 1884–91 (reaches only to 1515); the *Vita* by P. Giviro, in Latin, Florence, 1548, in Italian, ib. 1549, in French, Paris, 1675. The best life is by W. Roscoe, London, 1805, reissue, 1886 (was translated into Fr. and Germ.). A work of distinct value is H. M. Vaughan, *The Medici Popes*, New York, 1908 (deals principally with Leo X.). Other lives are: A. Fabroni, Pisa, 1797; Audin, Paris, 1844; and *Life and Times of Leo X.*, London, 1850. Consult also: T. Dandolo, *Il Secolo di Leone X.*, 3 vols., Milan, 1861; *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. ii., chap. i., New York, 1904; Ranke, *Popes*, i. 57–68, iii. 11–22; Creighton, *Papacy*, v. 203–vi. 213 (essential); Bower, *Popes*, iii. 291–299; Schaff, *Christian Church*, vol. vi.–vii.; Pastor, *Popes*, vol. iv.; and much of the literature on Luther; Reformation.

Leo XI. (Alessandro Ottaviano de' Medici): Pope Apr. 1–Apr. 27, 1605. He was born in Florence 1535, and was archbishop of his native city, when chosen to succeed Clement VIII. by a combination of Italian and French cardinals and against the wish of the king of Spain. The French triumph, however, was frustrated by his death after a pontificate of but four weeks. K. Benrath.

Bibliography: F. Petrucelli della Gattina, *Hist. diplomatique des conclaves*, ii. 404 sqq., Paris, 1864; M. Brosch, *Geschichte des Kirchenstaates*, Gotha, 1880–82; Ranke, *Popes*, ii. 106; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 327.

Leo XII. (Annibale della Genga): Pope 1823–1829. He was born at the castle of the Genga, near Spoleto, Aug. 22, 1760. Pius VI. and Pius VII. employed him in various missions in Germany, the latter particularly in the negotiations for concordats in the early years of the nineteenth century (see Concordats and Delimiting Bulls, VI., 2, § 1). Pius VII. made him cardinal in 1816. He was chosen pope to succeed Pius VII. after a five weeks' conclave on Sept. 28, 1823, and forthwith transferred the high office of secretary of state, till then held by Cardinal Ercole Consalvi (q.v.), to one of the *Zelanti*, the octogenarian Cardinal della Somaglia. The government and administration of the States of the Church now assumed a narrowly ecclesiastical character which disordered the finances and irritated the adherents of the party of progress. The episcopal jurisdiction was extended into civil affairs; the competency of the provincial courts, as well as the right of women to inherit, was restricted; and vaccination was forbidden. On the other hand, the needlessly large corps of public servants was reduced, better training of officials was required, and stricter surveillance was exercised. The segregation of the Jews in ghetti—a practise which had been done away during the French control—and restraint of their mercantile activities was again enforced. The secret revolutionary leagues in the Romagna were summarily dealt with; in the course of three months Cardinal Rivarola, who was dispatched to Bologna in 1825, passed 507 sentences, condemning seven to death, the others to hard labor for life or long terms of imprisonment. A murderous attempt on Rivarola moved him to flight, and the pope then commissioned Monsignor Invernizzi in his place, who pursued the same object, with recourse to denunciation, false promises of indemnity, and the like. Leo's administration of the Church was characterized by the same extreme reactionary policy, shadowed forth in his very first encyclical, May 3, 1824, wherein he issued the invitation to the next jubilee festival at Rome. The same spirit was also operative in connection with the concordats concluded during his pontificate with Hanover, the ecclesiastical province of the Upper Rhine, and, especially, several of the South American governments (see Concordats and Delimiting Bulls,

VI. 2, §§ 4–5). In France, Lamennais (q.v.), who embodied all the neo-Catholicism and Ultramontanism just then in vogue, evoked the pope's approval. He came to Rome in 1824 and Leo offered him a cardinal's hat. The pope's relations with the French government were not cordial. He carried on tedious negotiations with the Netherlands over the question of the nomination of bishops and the closing of the clerical seminaries, which came to nothing because of the revolution in Belgium (cf. O. Mejer, *Die Propaganda*, ii. 98 sqq., Göttingen, 1853; F. Nippold, *Die römisch-katholische Kirche im Königreich der Niederlande*, Leipsic, 1877, 149–151). K. Benrath.

Bibliography: A. de Montor, *Hist. du Pape Léon XII.*, 2 vols., Paris, 1843; J. G. Köberle, *Leo XII. und der Geist der römischen Hierarchie*, Leipsic, 1846; N. P. S. Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, London, 1859; A. von Reumont, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, iii. 2, p. 679, Berlin, 1870; L. von Ranke, *Historisch-biographische Studien*, pp. 143–157, Leipsic, 1877; M. Brosch, *Geschichte des Kirchenstaates*, ii. 308 sqq., Gotha, 1881; F. Nippold, *Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 70–79, Elberfeld, 1883; F. Nippold, *Papacy in the 19th. Century*, pp. 71–81, New York, 1900; F. Nielsen, *Papacy in the 19th Century*, 2 vols., ib. 1906; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 434–464.

Early Life and Training.

Leo XIII. (Joachim Vincent Pecci): Pope 1878–1903. He came of a noble Siennese family, and was born at Carpineto (42 m. s.e. of Rome) Mar. 2, 1810. At the age of eight he was sent to the Jesuit college at Viterbo where he remained six years and then entered the famous Roman College in 1825. He proved himself a diligent as well as a brilliant student and developed early an extraordinary aptitude for the Latin classics. In 1830 he matriculated for divinity in the Gregorian University at Rome and received his doctor's degree two years later. Having decided to prepare himself for a diplomatic career, he entered, in 1833, the Academy or College of the Nobles at Rome where he remained until 1837, devoting himself to the study of canon and civil law, taking courses in these branches at the University of the Sapienza. In 1837 he was made a domestic prelate by Gregory XVI., who also appointed him to the office of Referendary of the papal signature, and at the end of the same year he was ordained to the priesthood. The following year, being only twenty-eight years of age, he was appointed to the difficult post of governor of the province of Benevento, which for some time had been in a very disturbed condition, being infested by smugglers and brigands, but the young prelate at once asserted his authority, and by severe and decisive measures speedily suppressed lawlessness and restored order to the province. In 1841 he was recalled and appointed to the more important charge of delegate of Spoleto, having his administrative headquarters in Perugia. He filled this position until 1843, when he was consecrated titular archbishop of Damietta and appointed papal nuncio to the court of Brussels. This post he occupied three years, and in the mean time he became quite popular in academic as well as in diplomatic circles. In 1846 he spent a few months in England, and, returning the same year to Rome, then to Paris, was appointed bishop of Perugia. His episcopate in this diocese lasted thirty-two years through a period of much political and religious disturbance connected with the various movements set on foot for the unification of the Italian states. As a bishop, besides taking an active part in the social and religious movements of the day, he showed more than ordinary zeal for the reform of abuses, and paid special attention to the hitherto much neglected education of the people in secular as well as religious matters. He was created cardinal by Pius IX. in 1853, and he remained in charge of his diocese until 1878, when, on the death of Pius IX., he was elected pope and took the name Leo XIII.

His Pontificate.

During his pontificate, which was one of the longest and most distinguished in the history of the papacy, he continued to display marked diplomatic and administrative ability. A lover of peace and unity, he applied himself with much tact to improve the rather strained relations between the papacy and the various powers, which had resulted from the reactionary ideas and policy of his predecessor. While he has been criticized for having shaped much of his diplomacy with a view to bringing about a restoration of the temporal power, it must be admitted, in view of the far-reaching results achieved, that his motives and policy far transcended this secondary object. It was mainly through his diplomatic ability that in Germany an end was put (1886) to the famous religious strife called the Kulturkampf which had lasted for nearly twenty years. In harmony with his general policy of conciliation he early favored a loyal acceptance of the republican form of government on the part of the French people, and though he was not a little blamed for this attitude by the royalists who were then counted the most enlightened and influential of French Catholics, he remained firm in his convictions which he set forth in an encyclical to the French people in 1892. As a churchman he was characterized by broad, tolerant and irenic views, and his policy was shaped not only with a view to the uplifting of those within the Church, but also to the ultimate reunion of all Christendom. Thus he evinced a lively and efficient interest in the religious welfare of the Slavonic races, and in the reunion with Rome of the various eastern churches. It was in a great measure through his efforts that the Armenian schism was extinguished in 1879, in connection with which event he issued in 1881 a bull decreeing the foundation of an Armenian college in Rome. His appeal in 1895 to the "Illustrious English Race" was dictated by the same irenic spirit and desire for unity, but whatever effect it might otherwise have produced was counteracted by his bull on Anglican orders issued the following year, which denied their validity. A fitting recognition of his zeal for peace as well as of his diplomatic ability was his appointment in 1885 to be arbiter in a dispute between Germany and Spain concerning the Caroline Islands. He took a deep interest in the intellectual and social problems of the day and did much for the promotion of learning. In this connection may be mentioned the publication of an encyclical on Christian philosophy in 1879; the foundation, shortly after, of the Academy of St.

Thomas Aquinas in Rome, together with the creation of a Congregation of Studies; the [partial] opening of the Vatican archives (1884) [Protestant scholars, however, are debarred from examining the papal archives in the period immediately prior to, in, or since the Protestant revolt]; the encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" on Scripture, and the appointment of the Biblical Commission in 1902. His interest in social questions and his zeal for the betterment of social conditions were manifested not only in his encyclical on Socialism issued in 1878, in his letter to the bishops of Brazil, and his encyclical on the condition of working men, but also in his attitude of tolerance with regard to the Knights of Labor, and in the encouragement and support given to Cardinal Lavigerie (q.v.) in his campaign against the African slave-trade.

Official Acts.

Among the more important official acts of his administration besides those already mentioned are the following: In 1878 a bull reestablishing the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Scotland; in the same year the encyclical "Inscrutabili" dealing with the evils which beset society in Christian countries; in 1880, the encyclical "Arcanum" on Christian marriage; in 1881 the encyclical "Diuturnum" in defense of the principle of rightful authority in the Church; in 1884 a bull authorizing the assembly of the third plenary Council of Baltimore; in 1893, sending of the first apostolic delegate to the United States. During his pontificate he remained always within the precincts of the Vatican, and in his private life he was simple, studious and devout. He was exceptionally well versed in scholastic philosophy, and his Latin poetry, written by way of pastime, is quite classical in its ease and elegance. Among his favorite devotions was that of the rosary, which by official letters he did much to promote throughout the Church. He passed away after a long and fruitful pontificate on July 20, 1903. James F. Driscoll.

Bibliography: Leo's *Great Encyclical Letters* have been translated, New York, 1903; also his *Poems, Charades and Inscriptions*, ib. 1902. Among the many lives which have been written, mention may be made of J. McCarthy, London, 1896; J. Oldcastle, ib. 1887; B. O'Reilly, ib. 1887; J. de Narfon, ib. 1899; G. Freund, Münster, 1902; B. D'Agen, Paris, 1907; De T'Serclaes, Bruges, 1907. Also cf. F. Nippold, *Geschichte des Katholizismus*, pp. 155 sqq., Berlin, 1901.

LEON (PONCE DE LEON), LUIS DE: Spanish poet and theologian; b. at Belmonte (90 m. s.e. of Madrid) 1527; d. at Madrigal (50 m. e.n.e. of Salamanca) Aug. 23, 1591. He joined the Augustinians at the age of sixteen, having already begun the study of theology under Melchior Cano at Salamanca, where he became professor in 1561 and proved a brilliant expounder of systematic theology. His method of always going back to the sources, especially the Scriptures and the Fathers, furnished occasion to two envious colleagues and other enemies to accuse him falsely of inclinations toward the Reformation and he was committed to the prison of the Inquisition at Valladolid in 1572, charged with expressing offensive and heretical opinions in his lectures and in an attempt to correct the text of the so-called edition of the Vulgate of Franciscus Vatablus (q.v.) and in a commentary on the Song of Songs. After weary waiting he was acquitted on Dec. 15, 1576, and restored to his professorship. He began his first lecture after his long imprisonment with the words, *Heri dicebamus* ("As we were saying yesterday"). The acts of his trial are printed in *Documentos ineditos*, vols. x. and xi. (Madrid, 1847). His Spanish writings, which include his poems, were issued by the Augustinian Antonio Merino (6 vols., Madrid 1804–16), and recently the Augustinians have edited his Latin writings (7 vols., Salamanca, 1891–95). K. Benrath.

Bibliography: Sources are the *Documentos ineditos*, ut sup. Consult: José Gonzales de Tejada, *Vida de Fray Luis de Leon*, Madrid, 1863; C. A. Wilkens, *Fray Luis de Leon*, Halle, 1866 (cf. H. Reusch, in *TLB*, 1867, pp. 478 sqq.); F. H. Reusch, *Luis de Leon und die spanische Inquisition*, Bonn, 1873; G. Ticknor, *Hist. of Spanish Literature*, ii. 75–87, Boston, 1864.

LEONARD, len′ard, DELEVAN LEVANT: Congregationalist; b. at Pendleton, N. Y., July 20, 1834. He was graduated at Hamilton College in 1859 and Union Theological Seminary in 1862. He was ordained in 1863, and held pastorates at New Preston, Conn., 1863–65, Darlington, Wis., 1865–1870, Normal, Ill., 1870–74, Hannibal, Mo., 1874–1875, and Northfield, Minn., 1875–81. He was then superintendent of home missions in Utah, Idaho, Montana, and adjacent territories 1881–87, after which he was pastor of the Congregational church at Bellevue, O., until 1892. Since 1893 he has been associate editor of *The Missionary Review of the World*. In theology he classes himself "among the liberal-conservatives, not caring for mere novelties in speculation, but ready to accept new statements of Christian truth if seemingly established by evidence, even in the realm of higher criticism." He has written: *The Story of Oberlin* (Boston, 1895); *A Hundred Years of Missions* (New York, 1895); *Missionary Annals of the Nineteenth Century* (Cleveland, O., 1899); and *History of Carleton College* (Chicago, 1904).

LEONARD, WILLIAM ANDREW: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Ohio; b. at Southport, Conn., July 15, 1848. He was educated at St. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y., from which, however, he was not graduated, and Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn., from which he was graduated in 1871. He was curate of Holy Trinity, Brooklyn (1871–72), rector of the Church of the Redeemer, Brooklyn (1872–81), and of St. John's, Washington (1881–89). In 1889 he was consecrated bishop of Ohio. He was chaplain of the Twenty-third Regiment of the New York State National Guard, and from 1897 to 1906 was in charge of the American Episcopal churches on the continent of Europe. In theology he is a High-churchman. He has written: *Via Sacra* (New York, 1875); *History of the Christian Church* (1883); and *Witness of the American Church to Christ* (New York, 1895).

Bibliography: W. S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 317, New York, 1895.

LEONTIUS, le-en′shĭus, OF BYZANTIUM: One of the most important Greek theologians of the first half of the sixth century; d. about 543. So many points in regard to his life and works are still open questions that it is impossible to do more than give a somewhat disjointed account of the present state of knowledge concerning both. Among the works in *MPG*, lxxxvi. 1185–2100, under the name of " Leontius of Byzantium or of Jerusalem," there are four of unequal length which occur in manuscript collections earlier than the year 1000 among the works of " Leontius the Monk " or " the Hermit." These are: (1) the tripartite work " Against the Nestorians and Eutychians "; (2) the " Solution of the Syllogisms Proposed by Severus "; (3) the " Thirty Chapters against Severus "; (4) the treatise " Against the Frauds of the Apollinarians." The first two undoubtedly belong to the same author, who wrote the first between 529 and 544. He had been a Nestorian in his youth, but had seen the error of his ways and become a zealous opponent of both the Monophysites and all whom he called " concealed Nestorians," meaning the adherents of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodorus of Tarsus. The " Thirty Chapters " are also by the same author, but do not seem to have been published as a substantive work. The last-named treatise is a masterpiece of patristic learning, possibly though by no means certainly from the same hand. The treatise *De sectis*, the longest known of the works ascribed to Leontius in Migne, was formerly thought to be, according to the Greek title, a work conceived on the basis of utterances of the Abbot Theodore, and, according to the time of the work as a whole, the date of Leontius was frequently put as late as 600. It is now, however, generally admitted that it contains genuine Leontian material in a later recasting, made between 579 and 607. In spite of much recent discussion, it still seems safe to regard it as based upon a substantive work by Leontius, and not (as with Möller) upon mere lecture-notes of his worked into literary shape by his disciple Theodore, or (as with Zahn) the conception of a third writer from information given by Theodore. It may be taken as demonstrated that the treatises of a Leontius of Jerusalem *Contra Nestorianos* (*MPG*, lxxxvi. 1396–1768) and *Contra Monophysitas* (ib. 1769–1901) offer in some way indubitably Leontian material—perhaps they also are a recasting of the treatise on which the *De sectis* is based. One thing seems sure, viz., the *Doctrina antiquorum patrum de verbi incarnatione* edited by F. Dekamp, Münster, 1907, compiled in the seventh century, quotes this fundamental work, not the *De sectis;* all that appears in the latter to suggest a date later than that of Leontius is absent in the *Doctrina* quotations. It is not possible to go further into detail as to the nature of this fundamental work until more textual investigations have been made; but the hypothesis that the " Solution " and the " Thirty Chapters " originally formed part of it still seems not improbable. It may have been a dogmatic-polemical treatise directed principally against Arians and Sabellians, Nestorians and Monophysites, perhaps consisting of separate chapters against particular heresies, in which the patristic citations were followed by explanations in the nature of dogmatic, polemical, and historical scholia, thus accounting for the quotations " from the scholia of Leontius," of which five exist in the *Doctrina*, and for the use of the word scholia in the Greek title of the *De sectis*.

Whoever Leontius may have been, it is clear that he was not merely an accomplished theologian but an influential man. The proposition that one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh, on the orthodoxy of which Justinian insisted, was evidently defended by him; the edict of the Three Chapters condemned Theodore (and Diodorus), whom he labored to confute; Justinian's policy followed the path of the orthodoxy of Cyril and of Chalcedon, which Leontius represented; the later orthodoxy took up many Leontian thoughts; and his Aristotelianism was the parent of scholasticism. Yet, strangely enough, tradition tells nothing certain of his life. The most one can do is to attempt to identify him with four bearers of the name in the reign of Justinian. (1) The Leontius, a relation of the influential *Comes* Vitalian, who came forward at Constantinople in 519 with the Scythian monks led by John Maxentius, resisted the " Nestorianizing " tendencies of the Roman legates then in Constantinople, and went to Rome to obtain a confirmation of the proposition just cited and a condemnation of Faustus of Riez, disappearing in 520. (2) The Leontius who in 531 (or 533), together with Hypatius of Ephesus and a certain Eusebius, appeared as an orthodox participant in the conference with the Severians arranged by Justinian. (3) The Leontius who in 536 appeared among the monks of Jerusalem before the council held in Constantinople, together with Domitian, later bishop of Ancyra, and Theodore Ascidas, to obtain the condemnation of Anthimus for Monophysite tendencies. (4) The " Origenist " Leontius, " a Byzantine in race," of whom Cyrillus Scythopolitanus recounts in his *Vita Sabæ* that he was received into the " new laura " between 519 and 521, went with Sabas in 531 to Constantinople, was there convicted of Origenism, returned later to the monastic settlements under Sabas and became a leader among the opponents of Theodore of Mopsuestia and his admirers, went again to Constantinople in 541 in the interests of his cause, and died there not long after. The last three of these are easily connected, and harmonize with the theological position of the writer Leontius, while the second is closely related to the first. The fourth identification alone offers positive difficulties—although the fact that the extant works of Leontius do not portray an " Origenist " in the sense of the *Vita Sabæ* is not an insuperable objection; and the silence of tradition as to the career of Leontius is most easily explained on the assumption that he was held to some extent to have compromised himself. If these identifications are accepted, the only period of his life left dark is that before 519; and the " Byzantine monk " of the *Doctrina* receives its confirmation from the " Byzantine in race " of the *Vita Sabæ*.

(F. Loofs.)

Bibliography: The earlier information is summed up in J. Fessler, *Institutiones patrologiæ*, ii. 934–935, Innsbruck, 1851, ed. B. Jungmann, consult ii., part 2, 1896. For later studies consult: F. Loofs, in *TU*, iii. 1–2, Leipsic, 1887, cf. T. Zahn, in *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, 1887, pp. 89–92, and W. Möller, in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1887, pp. 336–339; F. Loofs, *Studien über die dem*

Johannes von Damaskus zugeschriebenen Parallelen, Halle, 1892; W. Rügamer, *Leontius von Byzanz, ein Polemiker aus der Zeit Justinians*, Würzburg, 1894; V. Ermoni, *De Leontio Byzantino et de eius doctrina christologica*, Paris, 1895; K. Holl, *Die Sacra parallela des Johannes Damascenus*, in *TU*, xvi., 1, Leipsic, 1896, cf. xx., 2, pp. xii. sqq., 1900; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 54 sqq., et passim; F. Diekamp, *Die origenistischen Streitigkeiten im 6. Jahrhundert*, Münster, 1899; O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, Freiburg, 1901; J. P. Junglas, *Leonitas von Byzanz; Studien zu seinen Schriften, Quellen, und Anschauungen*, Paderborn, 1908.

LEONTIUS OF NEAPOLIS: Bishop of Neapolis, Cyprus; flourished in the seventh century. Of his life little is known, except that he was born in Cyprus and was educated by his fellow countryman, John, archbishop of Alexandria (611–619). He was alive in the reign of Constans II. (642–668). He was a prolific author, and at the Second Council of Nicæa (787) his compatriot Constantinus, bishop of Constantia, spoke highly of his eulogies. Two homilies of this class have been published, one on the presentation of Christ in the Temple and the other on the feast of Mid-Pentecost. More interest attaches to a work in five books against the Jews, of which two fragments have been edited, two others being extant in manuscript. In 614 Jerusalem was betrayed to the Persians and the Holy Cross was carried away. The consequent excitement called forth a wide-spread persecution of the Jews, and Leontius' book was apparently evoked by disturbances in Alexandria. His most important works, however, were biographies written in popular style for readers of general culture, such as his life of Spyridion of Trimithus, extant only in a revamping by Metaphrastes, but apparently comprising originally a naive collection of marvels. He also wrote a biography of Johannes Eleemon, archbishop of Alexandria (q.v.), which is of value for its portrayal of Alexandrian life just before the Arab conquest. It was extremely popular and was translated into Latin at the instance of Pope Nicholas I. Leontius' biography of Symeon of Emesa is likewise valuable for its presentation of current ideas, but otherwise historically worthless. It is based on the Oriental belief that madmen are divinely blessed, and did much to spread this conception among the Greeks and Russians, whose monasteries in succeeding centuries presented numerous examples of " inspired idiots." Many other works still extant in manuscript are ascribed to this Leontius, but he is frequently confused by scribes with others of the name, such as Leontius the Presbyter, Leontius of Byzantium, and Leontius of Jerusalem. (H. Gelzer †.)

Bibliography: The *Opera* are in *MPG*, xciii. His " Life of John the Merciful " was edited by H. Gelzer, Freiburg, 1893. Consult: F. Loofs, *Leontias von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche*, Leipsic, 1887; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 112, 389, 468; H. Gelzer, in *Historische Zeitschrift*, lxi (1889), 1–32.

Reports of Josephus.

LEONTOPOLIS: The name of a place in Lower Egypt important in connection with Jewish history as the site of the temple built by an Onias (III. or IV.) either c. 170 or c. 154 B.C. The place mentioned is apparently located by Josephus (*War*, VII., x. 3) 180 stadia (about twenty miles) from Memphis, in the nome of Heliopolis. The sources of information are Josephus, *War*, I., i. 1, VII., x. 2 sqq.; *Ant.*, XII., ix. 7, XIII., iii. 1–3, cf. XII., v. 1. According to *War*, I., i. 1 " Onias the high priest " was compelled under Antiochus Epiphanes to flee from Jerusalem and took refuge in Egypt with Ptolemy Philometor, who gave him a location in the nome of Heliopolis, where he " built a city resembling Jerusalem, and a temple that was like its temple." In *Ant.*, XII., ix. 7 Josephus says that it was the son of " Onias the high priest " who, being " left a child when his father died . . . fled to Ptolemy," and received the gift in the nome named wherein he built a temple like that at Jerusalem. With this agrees *Ant.*, XII., v. 1, which says that the son whom Onias left " was yet but an infant." *Ant.*, XIII., iii. 1–3 affirms that Onias " the son of Onias the high priest " fled to Ptolemy Philometor, and that, stimulated by the prophecy of Isaiah (xix. 19) uttered 600 years earlier, this Onias wrote a letter to Ptolemy and Cleopatra, which letter Josephus professes to give. In this Onias asks that a ruined sanctuary be given him that he may purge it and erect on its site a temple which may serve as a place where the Jews may meet, implying that this will gain for the king the favor of the Jews against the Syrian king. The reported reply of the two sovereigns grants the ruined temple at Leontopolis, " named from . . . Bubastis." The second of these letters, at any rate, is generally recognized as spurious. In *War*, VII., x. 2 Josephus affirms that " Onias, son of Simon, one of the Jewish high priests " fled from Antiochus, was received kindly by Ptolemy, obtained leave to build a temple, saying that " the Jews would be readier to fight against Antiochus," built the temple not like that at Jerusalem but to resemble a tower, sixty cubits high, furnished it in the same manner, only substituting a suspended golden lamp for the candlestick, and surrounding the structure with a wall of burnt brick, though the gate (ways) were of stone. The king also gave a large endowment in lands to furnish the requisite revenues for the support of the temple. In § 4 of this chapter Josephus reports that Lupus, governor of Alexandria, and his successor Paulinus (which places the date at 70–73 A.D.) stripped and closed the temple after it had been open for worship " 343 years."

Three Difficulties.

These accounts by the same writer raise three difficulties. (1) Who was the Onias who built the temple? Two of the accounts distinctly imply Onias III., especially *Ant.*, VII., x. 2, which calls him " son of Simon." With this goes *War*, I., i. 1, " Onias the high priest," since the son of this Onias never served as high priest, at least in Jerusalem, being, as Josephus says elsewhere (*Ant.*, XII., v. 1), left an infant. But the other passages cited oppose this, stating that it was the son of Onias the high priest, commonly known as Onias IV. This latter position is supported by the testimony of II Macc. iv. 33–34, according to which Onias III. was slain after being enticed from the well-known sanctuary of Daphne near Antioch. (2) The second difficulty concerns the date of the building of the temple, and its solution depends upon the solution of the first difficulty. If Onias III. was the builder, 170–163 must be the period of erection; if Onias IV., then c. 154 must be accepted. The statement in *Ant.*, VII., x. 4 that the temple was open for 343 years is usually regarded as a mistake for 243, which would place the founding of the structure c. 170 B.C. But this calculation may be bound up with Josephus' evident confusion as to the person of the founder, and the later date may be regarded as correct. (3) The site is by the statements of Josephus and all earlier indications left a matter of doubt. *Ant.*, XIII., iii. 2 seems to fix it definitely at "Leontopolis, in the nome of Heliopolis . . . named from the country Bubastis." This can not be the well-known Leontopolis, which was the capital of a province north of that of Heliopolis. Moreover, in *War*, VII., x. 3 the location is given as 180 stadia (about twenty miles) from Memphis. But a Leontopolis is not known in the region, apart from the capital already mentioned.

The Temple Found.

In the *Itinerarium Antonini* (ed. G. Parthey and M. Pinder, Berlin, 1848) appears mention of a *Vicus Judæorum*, which is placed thirty-four Roman miles northeast of Heliopolis. E. Naville finds that in this neighborhood a temple to Bast (the lion-headed goddess from whom Leontopolis took its name) once stood, and that near by is a Tel al-Yehudiyeh, "Mound of the Jew," though at the time he investigated (1887) he found no traces of a Jewish temple there (*The Academy*, Feb. 25, 1888, pp. 140–141; Egypt Exploration Fund, *Seventh Memoir*, pp. 20, 22). Another place of the same name is found farther south, where a sepulchral inscription, *Oniou patēr*, was discovered (*The Academy*, 1888, pp. 49–50, 140–142, 193–194; Egypt Exploration Fund, ut sup.). The *Notitia dignitatum orientis*, chap. xxv (ed. E. Böcking, Bonn, 1839), knows a *Castra Judæorum*, possibly identical with the more southern of the two places. Finally, in 1905, near the station Shibin al-Kanater, 20 miles from Cairo (Baedeker's *Egypt*, p. 166, 1908), investigation at a mound called Tel al-Yehudiyeh (20 miles from Cairo) found the traces of the temple in question. The ground showed a settlement roughly in the shape of a triangle, on the east side a wall of stone 767 feet long, with the entrance to the enclosure at the west acute angle, while the temple ruins were at the south point. The entire enclosure covered between three and four acres. The temple showed a structure of which the inner court was sixty-three feet long by thirty-two to twenty-seven feet wide, and an outer court forty-four feet long by twenty-seven to twenty-one feet wide; the architecture was Corinthian in style with Syrian features; the area was proportioned like that of the temple at Jerusalem. The traces of sacrifice were present in the shape of huge sunken cylinders of pottery which show that they were used for sacrifice, alternate layers of earth and burnt material showing that fresh earth was thrown on each sacrifice of fire so as to deaden it. The pottery of the mound outside the old town belongs to the second century B.C., the coins are of the period of Ptolemy Philometor, and sherds show Jewish names. These data, reconciling differences and agreeing with the conditions required, set finally at rest the question of the fact and the place of this interesting episode of Jewish history. GEO. W. GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Egyptian Research Account, vol. xii., W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Hyksos and Israelite Cities*, London, 1906; Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 97–100, Eng. transl., II., ii. 286–288 (contains older literature); A. Büchler, *Die Tobiaden und die Oniaden in II. Makkabäerbuch*, Vienna, 1899; *Jews' College Jubilee Volume*, pp. 39–77, London, 1906 (collects discussions of the Onias Temple); C. H. H. Wright, *Light from Egyptian Papyri before Christ*, ib. 1908; J. G. Duncan, *Exploration of Egypt and the O. T.*, New York, 1909; *EB*, iii. 3507–11.

LEPROSY.

Geographical Distribution (§ 1).
Biblical Conception (§ 2).
General Treatment of Lepers (§ 3).
Lepra Mosaica (§ 4).
Lepra Tuberosa (§ 5).
Lepra Maculosa, Lepra Anæsthetica (§ 6).

1. Geographical Distribution.

This disease has existed from times preceding the ages of which history takes cognizance in its backward sweep, has spread widely over the civilized and barbarous world, and still exists endemically in some regions. The Hebrews were sorely afflicted with it before leaving Egypt (indeed, the banks of the Nile, with their humid atmosphere, seem to have been a cradle of the disease); so much so, that, according to the historian Manetho (Josephus, *Apion*, i. 26), the Egyptians drove them out on account of this plague of leprosy. It probably existed in Syria before the Hebrews came bringing it with them into that country. From Egypt and Palestine it spread to Greece and Italy, and other countries bordering upon the Mediterranean. It appears to have been introduced into Central and Western Europe somewhere between the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, probably through the agency of the returning crusaders, and spread with alarming rapidity. Toward the end of the fifteenth century it had almost disappeared from those sections of Europe. At present, leprosy, or *Elephantiasis Grecorum*, is found on the coasts and islands of the Mediterranean, Black, and Caspian Seas, in Norway, Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine, on the coasts of the Indian and China Seas, in the islands of the Australian Archipelago, in South and Central America, in Hawaii, in some parts of the United States, and in Iceland.

2. Biblical Conception.

By almost all peoples and races, leprosy has been regarded as a visitation of God on account of some sin, and the lepers have been kept apart from the rest of the people. The Jews were told that it came upon a man for idolatry, blasphemy, unchastity, theft, slander, false witness, false judgment, perjury, infringing the borders of a neighbor, devising malicious plans, or creating discord between brothers. Lepers were considered unclean (Lev. xiii. 44–46), had to rend their garments (excepting in the case of the women), cover their faces, go with unkempt hair, and cry, "Unclean, unclean!" They had to live without the camp or city; had a special part of the synagogue reserved for them; and any thing they touched, or any house into which they entered, was declared unclean. An elaborate ceremonial was prescribed for the cleansing of the leper when the disease had left him (cf. Lev. xiv., and see Diseases and the Healing Art, Hebrew). Among the Jews, not only was leprosy considered as attacking human beings, but also it was declared to be in garments, houses, and vessels (Lev. xiii. 47–59, xiv. 33–53); and ceremonies were prescribed for their cleansing. The exact nature of this leprosy of garments and houses is not known. Its distinctive signs were, in a garment, greenish or reddish spots which spread; in a house, greenish or reddish streaks lower than the surface of the wall which spread. This was, probably, in either case, a species of mildew, or else indicated the presence of some fungus, which, by contact, would generate disease in the human (see House, The Hebrew, and Its Appointments). The Jerusalem Targum regarded it as a visitation on a house built with unjust gains.

3. General Treatment of Lepers.

The Persians went even further than the Jews, and excluded foreign lepers from their country. The Greek writers thought leprosy was a punishment for some sin against Phœbus. The Arabs will neither sleep near nor eat with lepers, nor marry into families known to be leprous. By the Church of Rome in early ages, lepers were regarded as dead, and the last rites of the Church were said over them. In 757 A.D. it was declared a ground for divorce, and the sound party could marry again. In France, at different times, laws were passed forbidding lepers to marry. The leper lost all control of his property, and could not inherit any; he could not act as a witness, nor challenge to a duel. Oddly enough, while, in general, leprosy was regarded as a punishment, in some parts of Europe it was held to be a sign of divine preference for those attacked; as, in a woman, it was to preserve her chastity. Lepers were regarded as saints, and received much honor and alms. All over Europe the lepers had to live apart, and had special churches, priests, etc. In the fifteenth century a special dress was prescribed for them. The houses in which these unfortunate ones lived were called "lazar-houses." They were generally located just outside the gates of the cities, in close proximity to some body of water, so that the inmates could bathe. They were usually religious in character. The inmates had to be silent, and attend morning prayer and mass; and in some of the houses they had to say so many prayers each day that they had very little time for anything else. No woman was allowed to enter the male lazar-houses, excepting the washerwoman; and she had to be of sober age and good manners, and must enter the house at a fixed time of day, when she could be seen of all. A female relative had to obtain special permission before she could speak to a male leper. These houses were supported largely by begging, entirely by alms.

4. Lepra Mosaica.

Between what is called "leprosy" in the English Bible, and the leprosy as described by the best authorities on skin diseases, there is very little correspondence: indeed, the writer is inclined to adopt the theory advanced in the article on leprosy in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (American edition, ii. 1630), that the leprosy of the Mosaic dispensation (*Lepra Mosaica*) is not one disease, but an enumeration of certain symptoms, which, on account of their frightful character, and tendency to spread, would render the individual an object of aversion, and demand his separation. It is certainly but in few points akin to *Elephantiasis Grecorum*, the modern leprosy. The symptoms of leprosy, as in Lev. xiii., and the expressions used there and elsewhere, "leprous," "white as snow," lead one to conjecture that *Lepra Mosaica* is analogous to *Lepra vulgaris*, more commonly called *Psoriasis*. Of *Lepra Mosaica* (Heb. *zaraʿath*), the leprosy of Lev. xiii., xiv., the most marked symptoms were "a rising, a scab, or a bright spot," "in the skin of the flesh" (Lev. xiii. 2), with a hair turned white in the rising, scab, or bright spot, these being deeper than the scarf-skin (xiii. 3), and spreading of the scab, etc. (xiii. 7, 8). As a more advanced case "quick raw flesh in the rising" (xiii. 10) is noted. Verse 18 implies that the disease may take its origin in a boil, with the same symptoms. In verse 29 the disease appears in the beard, or hair of the head, coming in the form of a scall, with thin yellow hairs in the patches. These are all the symptoms; they are probably given merely as initial symptoms, so that the priest might recognize the onslaught of different diseases in their earliest stages. The "rising" may correspond to the tubercles of *Lepra tuberculosa*, or the *bullæ* of *Lepra anæsthetica* of recent authors. The scall of the head may be the *Morphœa alopeciata*, or *Fox-mange*, placed by Kaposi (*Hautkrankheiten*, Vienna, 1880) as a subdivision of the second form of leprosy, *Lepra maculosa*. Verses 12–17 state that if the patient is white all over he is clean, no doubt because the disease had then run its course. In this case it is probably a general *Psoriasis*.

Modern leprosy, *Elephantiasis Grecorum*, is divided into three varieties: (1) *Lepra tuberosa*, the tubercular form; (2) *Lepra maculosa*, the spotted or streaked form; (3) *Lepra anæsthetica*, the anesthetic form. For months or years before the outbreak of the disease, the patient may have vague prodromal symptoms, as weakness, loss of appetite, sleeplessness, lassitude, slight fever, diarrhea and sometimes *pemphigus blebs* (little blisters).

5. Lepra Tuberosa.

In *Lepra tuberosa* the disease begins with the outbreak, on the general surface of the body, of irregular or round-shaped spots, in size from a finger-nail to the palm of the hand; at first red, and disappearing under pressure; soon becoming gray to sepia brown or bronze color. Over the spots the skin is smooth and glistening (as if painted with oil), or bronzed and thickened, or slightly prominent, and painful on pressure. The spots are distributed over the trunk and extremities, face, hands, and feet. In some situations they become confluent; in some, disappear; in others, disappear in the center, while the peripheries extend, thus forming ring shapes. The tubercles, the distinctive type of this form, appear after the disease has lasted months or years; are of various sizes, up to that of a hazelnut, and are either slightly raised above the level of the skin, or quite prominent; dirty-brown-red in color and glistening; hard-elastic to soft to the touch; covered with epidermic scales; diffused or closely pressed together, and forming either irregular uneven plaques, or regular circles. They are principally located on the face and ears. On the eyebrows they form thick parallel rows, projecting over the eyes; on the cheeks, nose, and chin they are massed into irregular heaps. The lips become thick, swollen, and protruding; the under lip hangs down; and this, with the prominent, overhanging, knotty eyebrows, and the deeply wrinkled forehead, gives the countenance a morose and stupid appearance. Sometimes the eyelids are everted, and the lobes of the ears hang down in thick masses. Consequent upon the eversion of the eyelids, disease of the eye sets in. The extremities also become tuberculated, though not so much as the face; and the presence of tubercles in the palms of the hands and soles of the feet render handling and walking very painful. Tubercles appear in the mucous membrane of the mouth, pharynx, and upper part of larynx; the tongue becoming thick and cracked, with loss of taste ensuing; the larynx becoming narrow, with loss of voice; the breath becoming sweetish. After many months, these tubercles may be absorbed, leaving behind dark pigmented atrophic places; sometimes they soften centrally, and spread out peripherally; sometimes break down, and form leprous ulcers, which tend to skin over, only to break down again. Sometimes the ulceration goes deeper; necrosis joins itself to it; a diffused inflammation sets in, leading, in the under extremities especially, to deep excavation, and finally opening of joints, and self-amputation of entire members (*Lepra mutilans*). Earlier or later anesthesia develops in different parts of the body, and the ulnar nerve will be found enlarged and cord-like. The disease is generally chronic, lasting some eight to ten years, the patient dying of specific marasmus, or some complicating disease of internal organs. Or the disease may be more acute, with high fever, and reaching in a few months to a state which in other cases is not reached in years.

6. Lepra Maculosa; Lepra Anæsthetica.

Lepra maculosa is characterized by the appearance on the skin of a large number of red or brown glistening spots, or by diffuse dark pigmentation, intermixed with which are white points, spots, or stripes; so that the body seems streaked. This frequently changes into the former variety, or into *Lepra anæsthetica*, in which anesthesia is the marked feature. It succeeds to the preceding forms, or else begins with an outbreak of *pemphigus bullæ* (water-blisters), which, on healing, leave white, glistening, and anesthetic places, or, breaking, leave ulcerations. Sometimes anesthesia appears on fully normal places; sometimes the spot has been red and hyperesthetic for months before. Over the anesthetic spots the skin often becomes wrinkled, the wrinkled places being bounded by a red, hyperesthetic border; the wrinkling only taking place where the anesthetic spots have become stable, for at first they tend to change their location. The anesthesia is complete, the patient not feeling a needle thrust deep into the muscles. The chief nerve-trunks become swollen, and painful to pressure. Sometimes hyperesthesia precedes anesthesia to such a degree, that the patient is not able to sit or lie for any length of time in one place, can not take anything in his hands, and walking and standing give him the greatest pain. The anesthesia is followed by atrophy of muscles, and wrinkling; the sphincter muscle of the eye becomes lamed; the under eyelid and the under lip hang down; the tears flow over the cheeks; and the saliva runs dribbling out of the mouth; and thus the face oftentimes, already swollen and out of shape by the presence of the tubercles, assumes a peculiar, old, idiotic, or foolish expression. The flexor muscles of the hand not being atrophied so much as the extensor, the fingers become half bent, the hollow of the hand becomes convex and pressed forward, the back of the hand bent in; the finger-ends become clubbed, finger-nails thinned; the hair falls out. Ulceration finally sets in at the anesthetic places, or the tissues gradually atrophy away till the skin, fasciæ and tendons disappear, one or another joint is laid bare, when suddenly a whole foot, hand, or extremity falls off. The patient grows foolish and apathetic, and dies after some years. Treatment is largely symptomatic. The best is to remove the patient from leprous regions.

The lepers whom our Lord healed were probably not afflicted with *Elephantiasis Grecorum*, but with *Elephantiasis vulgaris* (Psoriasis).

The cause of leprosy is the invasion of the skin by the *bacillus lepræ*, an organism discovered by Hansen in 1874. The disease is contagious, and not hereditary. It occurs in both sexes, but rather more frequently in men. Its period of incubation is very long. While it is wide-spread over the world it is endemic in certain regions. It seems that either a damp and cold climate, or a hot and moist one, favors its development and spread, and that food bears no relation to it. Some, however, insist that it is due to the eating of fish. G. T. JACKSON, M.D.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: K. Wolff, *Leprastudien*, Leipsic, 1885; H. Leloiz, *Traité . . . de la lèpre*, Paris, 1886; A. Lutz, *Zur Morphologie des Leprabacillus*, Hamburg, 1886; G. Thin, *Leprosy*, London, 1891; E. A. Senft, *Soixant-quinze années parmi les lépreux*, Neuchâtel, 1893; G. A. Hansen and C. Looft, *Leprosy in its Clinical and Pathological Aspects*, Bristol, 1895; E. Besnier, *Sur le lèpre; rôle étiologique*, Paris, 1897; V. Babes, *Untersuchungen über den Leprabacillus und über die Histologie der Lepra*, Berlin, 1898; J. Hutchinson, *Leprosy and Fish Eating*, Chicago, 1906. An important pamphlet, *Beobachtungen über den Aussatz im heiligen Lande* (Herrnhut, 1908), is by Dr. Einsler, for nearly twenty years head of the Jesus Hilfe Hospital for Leprosy in Jerusalem.

For the Biblical side consult: J. R. Bennett, *Diseases of the Bible*, London, 1887; G. N. Münch, *Die Zaraath der hebräischen Bibel; Einleitung in die Geschichte des Aussatzes*, Leipsic, 1893; W. M. Thompson, *The Land and the Book*, ii. 516–520, 200, New York, 1859; E. C. A. Riehm, *Handwörterbuch des biblischen Altertums*, pp. 155–159, Leipsic, 1893; J. F. Schamberg, *The Nature of the Leprosy of the Bible*, in *Philadelphia Polychrome*, vii (1898), nos. 47–48; Benzinger, *Archäologie*, pp. 481–482; *DB*, iii. 95–99; *EB*, iii. 2763–68; and literature under DISEASES AND THE HEALING ART, HEBREW. On the Biblical prescriptions regarding it the one book is A. Dillmann and V. Ryssel, *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*, pp. 553 sqq., Leipsic, 1897.

For the historical side of the medical practise consult: E. Vignat, *Les Lépreux et les chevaliers de S. Lazare de Jérusalem*, Orléans, 1884; R. Héry, *Les Léproseries dans l'ancienne France*, Paris, 1896; E. Néret, *La Prophylaxie de la lèpre au moyen-âge*, ib. 1896; L. Le Grand, *Les Maisons-Dieu et léproseries . . . de Paris, 14. siècle*, Paris, 1898; E. Ehlers, *Danish Lazar Houses in the Middle Ages*, London, 1901.

LE QUIEN, le kî″ān′, **MICHEL:** French Dominican; b. at Boulogne Oct. 8, 1661; d. at Paris Mar. 12, 1733. He became a Dominican at the age of twenty, and throughout the long period of his literary activity was librarian of the monastery of his order in the Rue St. Honoré, Paris. His principal polemical works, which are of minor interest, are *Défense du texte hébreu et de la version vulgate* (Paris, 1690); *Stephani de Altimura panoplia contra schisma Græcum* (1718), a defense of the papal claims to supremacy against Nectarius, patriarch of Jerusalem; *La Nullité des ordinations anglicanes* (2 vols., 1725); and *La Nullité des ordinations anglicanes demontrée de nouveau* (2 vols., 1730). Far more important was his edition of John of Damascus in Greek and Latin (2 vols., Paris, 1712; reprinted, with additions, *MPG*, xciv.–xcvi.); and, above all, his *Oriens Christianus in quatuor patriarchatus digestus* (3 vols., Paris, 1740), modeled on D. de Sainte-Marthe's *Gallia Christiana*, and treating in the first volume of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace as dioceses of the patriarchate of Constantinople, in the second of Illyricum (as the fourth Constantinopolitan diocese) and the patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch, and in the third of the dioceses of the Chaldean and Jacobite Churches. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Quétif and J. Echard, *Scriptores ordinis prædicatorum*, ii. 808–809, Paris, 1721; H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius*, ii. 1064–66, Innsbruck, 1893; *KL*, vii. 1827–28.

LÉRINS, lê″ran (**LERINUM**), **MONASTERY OF:** An old monastery on the island of Saint-Honorat (one of the Lérins group), off the coast of southern France, opposite Cannes, founded by St. Honoratus about 400. Honoratus was of Gallo-Roman origin and appears to have belonged to an aristocratic family. In early youth he began a monastic routine on an island near Marseilles; later he traveled in the East, and on his return he visited Italy and contracted a friendship with Paulinus of Nola (q.v.). He then settled on the island of Lerinum (now Saint-Honorat). The number of his companions soon increased, and, though great freedom prevailed in the manner of life, Honoratus continued general superior. Johannes Cassianus (q.v.), founder of the slightly younger monastic community at Marseilles, dedicates to him a portion of his *Collationes patrum*, and styles him president of the great cloister of brethren. As presbyter, Honoratus also discharged the spiritual functions.

It is doubtful what cloistral rule was in force on Lerinum before the introduction of the Benedictine rule about 661. Arnold has demonstrated that the founder composed no rule, but that the order of living which he had established after Egyptian precedents was transmitted by tradition. The spiritual exercises included fasting, singing of hymns, and prayer at appointed hours. The monks also tilled the soil and attended to the education of youth. It is probable that the monastic studies consisted mainly in the introduction of auxiliary means for the understanding of the Bible.

The foundation of Honoratus quickly attained great renown, becoming the hearth of rejuvenation for the secularized Gallic Church and filling the bishops with a more earnest ascetic spirit. The island of Lerinum came to be the nursery of the so-called Semipelagianism. Eucherius of Lyons, Vincentius, and Salvianus, spent some time as monks of Lerinum. Honoratus himself became bishop of Arles in 426, but died in 429. Maximus and Faustus of Riez were his able successors, the latter being one of the most eminent upholders of Semipelagianism. Cæsarius of Arles spent considerable time at Lerinum under Abbot Porcerius. Amid the ravages of the sixth century (Provence fell into the hands of the Franks in 537) the discipline of the cloister declined. Abbot Marinus desired to introduce the milder Agaunensian rule; and under Abbot Stephen, who entertained St. Augustine of Canterbury on his way to the Anglo-Saxons, there set in a total decay of discipline. About 661 Aigulf, of the cloister of Fleury (Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire), reformed Lerinum according to the Benedictine rule; but the ardent Benedictine was assassinated by an opposing faction. By 690, however, Lerinum had again reached such a flourishing state that St. Amandus, then abbot, is said to have had under him 3,700 monks.

About 730 the wealthy cloister was plundered by the Saracens. It indicates a depressed state of affairs again, when in 964 the Burgundian King Conrad ceded Lerinum to the abbot of Mont-Majeur in behalf of the restoration of order. Soon afterward, however, Pope Benedict VII. made over Lerinum to Abbot Mayolus of Cluny. Afterward Odilo of Cluny appears as abbot of Lerinum, which he visited in 1022. Then followed local abbots; but with the union with the congregation of Cluny there began for Lerinum a new period of splendor. At all events, the wealth and influence of the monastery were still growing in the thirteenth century. In the fourteenth century the monks were no longer disposed to be *fratres*, but desired to be *domini*, and at a general chapter in 1319 they resolved that it be left free to every monk, prior, and conventual, to acquire and administer property. Urban IV. and the popes of Avignon, John XXII. and Clement VI., bestowed the rich benefices *in commendam*. Attempts at reform, in connection with the efforts of Benedict XII., proved of little avail.

During the Great Schism the cloister stood on the side of the Roman obedience. After having again been consigned in the second half of the fifteenth century to commendatory abbots, the monastery entered upon a new period in 1515. To speed the cloister's reform, the incumbent at that time, Augustus of Grimaldi (later bishop of Grasse), imported some monks of Cluny and contrived the annexation of Lerinum to the Italian Benedictine congregation of St. Justina of Padua. After his death, however, Francis I. again bestowed the abbey *in commendam.* Du Bellay was the first in tenure; Cardinals Lavalette and Mazarin were in possession in the century following. When after the death of Philip of Vendôme, in 1727, the monks promised the bishop of Grasse a pension of 4,000 livres if he would effect, with Cardinal de Fleury, the restoration of free abbatical election, the latter prelate preferred rather to appropriate the monastery outright; and in 1732 he procured a royal brief, by the terms of which, on condition of the bishop's obtaining confirmation thereof by the pope, the monastery was to be conveyed in perpetuity to him and his successors. In 1788 the monastery was secularized, and in 1791 the island of Saint-Honorat was sold at auction for 37,000 livres. In 1853 the bishop of Fréjus bought back the island; and in 1859 the church was restored to divine service and monks from Saint-Pierre de Marseille were stationed on the premises.

G. Grützmacher.

Bibliography: Hilary of Arles' *Sermo de vita S. Honorati* is in *ASB*, Jan., ii. 17–24, and in *MPL*, l. 1249 sqq. Consult: L. Pierrugues, *Vie de S. Honorat*, Paris, 1875; Silfersberg, *Historia monasterii Lerinensis*, Copenhagen, 1834; Berengier, in *Revue de l'art chrétien*, 1870, pp. 176 sqq.; F. Arnold, *Cäsarius von Arelate und die . . . Kirche seiner Zeit*, pp. 94 sqq., Leipsic, 1894; A. Malnorg, *St. Césaire*, pp. 5 sqq., Paris, 1894; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, viii. 433, 439–442, 452, x. 377; *DCB*, iii. 138; Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, v. 116 sqq.; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, i. passim.

LESLIE, CHARLES: Nonjuror and controversialist; b. at Dublin, Ireland, July 17, 1650; d. at Glasslough (70 m. n.n.w. of Dublin), County Monaghan, Apr. 13, 1722. He studied at the Enniskillen school and at Trinity College, Dublin (M.A., 1673), and began the study of law at the Temple, but took holy orders in 1680. He was preferred to the chancellorship of Connor July 13, 1686. Though a zealous Protestant he was a stanch supporter of the Stuart dynasty, and for refusing to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary was deprived of his benifice in 1689. He then removed to London and entered upon a period of controversial writing that extended over some twenty years. He attacked the king, Whig divines, Jews, Quakers, Papists, Dissenters, and especially the Deists. In 1693 he visited St. Germains and obtained from the pretender the *congé d'élire* for the consecration of the nonjuring bishops. When in 1710 his Jacobite zeal had led to the issuing of a warrant for his arrest, he secluded himself at White Waltham, Berkshire, and in Apr., 1711, fled to St. Germains. Later he returned to England and passed under the alias of Mr. White, but in Aug., 1713, he repaired to Bar-le-Duc and took up his residence in the household of the pretender. After the failure of the Jacobite rebellion of 1715 he accompanied the pretender to Rome. In 1721 he returned to Ireland. He is now remembered principally for one book, *A Short and Easy Method with the Deists* (London, 1698, and often). Other works are: *Gallienus redivivus* (Edinburgh, 1695), an attack on William III.; *The Snake in the Grass* (London, 1696), an attack on the Quakers; *A Short and Easy Method with the Jews* (1698); *The Case of the Regale and of the Pontificate* (1700; new ed., 1838); and *The Truth of Christianity Demonstrated* (1711). He expounded his political philosophy in a periodical founded by him called *The Rehearsal* (1705–09; reprinted, 4 vols., 1708–09; also 6 vols., 1750). Before his death he collected his *Theological Works* (2 vols., 1721; reprinted, 7 vols., Oxford, 1832).

Bibliography: R. J. Leslie, *Life and Writings of Charles Leslie*, London, 1885; the *Life*, prefixed to the Oxford ed. of his *Theological Works*, ut sup.; L. Stephen, *English Thought in the 18th Century*, i. 196–201, 241, New York, 1881; *DNB*, xxxiii. 77–83 (contains a good list of authorities). Consult also T. Lathbury, *History of the Nonjurors*, London, 1862.

LESLIE (LESLEY), JOHN: Scottish Roman Catholic historian and statesman; b. in Scotland 1527; d. at Gurtenburg, near Brussels, May 30, 1596. He studied in Aberdeen, Paris, and Poitiers, was appointed canon of the cathedral church at Aberdeen, 1547, canonist in King's College, Aberdeen, 1553, official of the diocese of Aberdeen 1558, and in 1559 was inducted into the parsonage, canonry, and prebend of Oyne. At the Reformation he became a champion of the Roman faith. He was one of Knox's opponents at the disputation in Edinburgh in 1561 and also one of the commissioners sent to France that year to bring over Mary Queen of Scots. He returned in Mary's train and became her principal ecclesiastical adviser. He was named professor of canon law at King's College and University of Aberdeen in 1562, and in 1565 he was made privy councilor, judge of the court of session, and bishop of Ross. He was Mary's chief commissioner at the conference at York in 1568, and later he was her ambassador at the court of Elizabeth. He was the chief means of communication between Mary and her supporters, and was the prime mover in numerous intrigues in her behalf. It was he who originated the scheme of a marriage between Mary and the duke of Norfolk, which ended with Norfolk's execution. For his part in the Norfolk conspiracy he was imprisoned in the Tower of London. Afterward he was transferred to Farnham Castle, and at the close of 1573 he was set at liberty, on condition that he leave the country. On the continent he continued his efforts for Mary and, after a year's sojourn in Paris, went to Rome to represent her interests at the papal court. He was sent by the pope on various missions in Mary's behalf. In 1579 he was made suffragan and vicar-general of the diocese of Rouen, and in 1593 he was appointed bishop of Coutances in Normandy. Unable to obtain possession of his see, owing to the unsettled condition of the country, he retired to a monastery of Augustinian monks at Gurtenburg. His literary fame rests upon his *De origine, moribus, et rebus gestis Scotorum* (Rome, 1578), which extends from the earliest times to the year 1562. An earlier Scottish version, written by Leslie in 1568–70 and presented to Queen Mary in 1571, was edited for the Bannatyne Club by T. Thomson under the title, *The History of Scotland from the Death of James I. in the Year 1436 to the Year 1561* (Edinburgh, 1830). Leslie wrote much in defense of Mary, and composed for her *Piæ afflicti animi consolationes . . . animi tranquilli munimentum et conservatio* (Paris, 1574).

Bibliography: An important and extensive list of sources is given at the end of the sketch in *DNB*, xxxiii. 93–99. Leslie's *Diary* was published by the Bannatyne Club in its *Miscellany*, vol. iii., Edinburgh, 1827. An early life is republished in vols. i., iii. of James Anderson's *Collections Relating to the Hist. of Mary Queen of Scotland*, 4 vols., ib. 1727–28. Consult also: *Life and Times of Rt. Rev. John Leslie*, London, 1885.

LESS, GOTTFRIED: German Lutheran theologian; b. at Konitz (65 m. s.w. of Danzig) Jan. 31, 1736; d. at Hanover Aug. 28, 1797. He was educated at the Collegium Friedericianum in Königsberg, and then studied theology at Jena and at Halle, where he was the pupil of S. J. Baumgarten. In 1757 he removed to Danzig where in 1761 he was appointed extraordinary professor of theology. After a scientific journey to Holland and England in 1762, he was appointed professor and preacher of the University of Göttingen (1763). In 1791 he was called to Hanover as court preacher, councilor of the consistory and general superintendent. His theological standpoint was that of a rationalistic and sentimental religion that conceded one point of the positive faith of the Church after the other to the spirit of the time, always believing that by the sacrifice of external matters there could be saved the principal point—"Christianity as the moral religion of nature." His numerous works belong mostly to the departments of apologetics, dogmatics, ethics, and practical theology. His principal work in apologetics is *Beweis der Wahrheit der christlichen Religion* (Bremen, 1768; Eng. transl., *Authenticity, Uncorrupted Preservation, and Credibility of the New Testament*, London, 1804). The sixth edition (Göttingen, 1786) was to form the second part of a larger unfinished work entitled *Ueber die Religion, ihre Geschichte, Wahl und Bestätigung*, of which two volumes appeared (Göttingen, 1783). Less was, however, recognized chiefly as an authority in ethics, on which he published *Ausführliches Handbuch der christlichen Moral und allgemeinen Lebenstheologie* (1777). In the sphere of dogmatics he wrote, *Handbuch der christlichen Religionstheorie für Aufgeklärtere* (1789). Of sermons he published besides other collections *Passionspredigten* (1778–84). Besides his chief works he wrote a great number of monographs and treatises on special topics in the various departments of theology. (Paul Tschackert.)

Bibliography: Holscher, *G. Less, ein biographisches Fragment*, Hanover, 1797; G. Frank, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie*, iii. 100 sqq., Leipsic, 1875.

LESSING, GOTTHOLD EPHRAIM: German critic and dramatist; b. at Kamenz (20 m. n.e. of Dresden) Jan. 22, 1729; d. at Brunswick Feb. 15, 1781. His father was a learned and respected Lutheran pastor, and his ancestors for generations had been clergymen. He attended the Fürstenschule, St. Afra, at Meissen, and while there began his comedy, *Der junge Gelehrte*. In 1746 he began to study theology at the University of Leipsic; his interest, however, lay more in the direction of literature and the drama. Later he took up the study of medicine and philology, but again busied himself with literature and the theater. In January, 1748, the Actress Neuber produced the play already named. Between 1748 and 1751 he was at Berlin, nominally a student of medicine, but actually earning his living by writing. He made translations, edited a supplement of the *Vossische Zeitung*, and began his critical and scholarly works. He translated Voltaire's defense in the suit with Abraham Hirsch and corresponded with the Frenchman, but later lost his respect for him. At the request of his father he resumed his studies at Wittenberg for a few months, where in 1752 he took his master's degree. His *Rettungen* was written during those months. He returned to Berlin in October, 1752, and continued to work on the *Vossische Zeitung*, publishing his writings in six volumes 1753–55. His *Miss Sara Sampson* was the first German tragedy of every-day life. He won the recognition of eminent scholars and the friendship of such men as Nicolai, Mendelssohn and Michaelis. He then took part in writing the *Briefe die neueste Litteratur betreffend*. In 1760 he accepted a position as secrètary to General Tauentzien, at Breslau, which gave him a feeling of security as to his livelihood while leaving him time to pursue his literary plans. He worked at his *Laokoon*, and *Minna von Barnhelm*, and studied Spinoza and the Church Fathers, but resigned his position in 1765. In 1767 he went to Hamburg to become dramaturg to the newly founded theater of Johann Friedrich Loewe. The theater did not last long. A printing and publishing business in which Lessing became interested was also a failure. At Hamburg he was intimate with Klopstock, Hagedorn, Claudius, and many other important persons. The crown prince of Brunswick, on the recommendation of Ebert, offered him a position as librarian at Wolfenbüttel, which he took in April, 1770, but the life there soon lost its attraction for him. In 1777 he began a series of theological polemics, which continued until the end of his life. He had been drawn into the strife by the publication of a manuscript of Berengar of Tours bearing on the controversy concerning the Eucharist (see Berengar of Tours, § 2). His connection with the library occasioned a number of scholarly investigations, the results of which he published in his *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Litteratur*. His *Nathan der Weise*, which was to some extent the outcome of his theological controversies, was finished in 1779. *Ernst und Falk* appeared in 1778–80, and *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechtes* in 1780. To the year 1778 belongs a work published by his brother after his death: *Neue Hypothese über die Evangelisten als bloss menschliche Geschichtsschreiber betrachtet*, in which he assumes the existence of an Aramaic original of Matthew which Matthew followed and condensed, and Mark and Luke supplemented with fresh material. Some features of this theory have proved permanent.

Lessing stands beside Goethe and Schiller as one of the German classical writers who is read by all educated persons as well as by mere students of literature. This fact is due in large measure to the perfection of form of his masterpieces, and also to his truthful, manly qualities. His influence on the German language has been very considerable. Various opinions have been expressed upon Lessing's attitude toward Christianity. Those who still distinguish between the religion of Christ and the Christian religion, holding to the former alone, may regard Lessing as the inaugurator of a new era in theology. But if it be maintained that the essential thing in Christianity is one's attitude toward the Savior, considering him as the object of Christian worship and not merely its teacher, Lessing's position can hardly be called a Christian one. Nevertheless, it can not be denied that his ethical views, and even his religious conceptions, were rooted in Christian soil. His religious opinions did not radically change, as some have suggested, toward the end of his life; nor was he a Spinozist, he was rather a follower of Leibnitz. He believed in a conscious God, who ruled above the world. In the revealed religions he saw preparatory stages to the truths of natural religion. He expected a third stage in religious history, following Judaism and Christianity, in which a new and everlasting evangel should be promulgated, a period in which every man would do right for right's sake.

(Carl Bertheau.)

Bibliography: The editions of Lessing's works are very numerous and easily accessible; Eng. transls. of his works are also numerous, e.g., *Laocoon*, by Sir. R. Phillimore, London, 1875; *Selected Prose Works*, by E. C. Beesley and Helen Zimmern, ib. 1879; *Dramatic Works*, in Bohn's Library, 2 vols., ib. 1875–78; *Education of the Human Race*, by F. W. Robertson, ib. 1858. Among the many biographies may be named: T. W. Danzel and G. E. Guhrauer, 2d ed. by W. von Maltzahn and R. Boxberger, 2 vols., Berlin, 1884; A. Stahr, Boston, 1866; H. Zimmern, London, 1878; J. Lime, 2 vols., London, 1879; E. Schmidt, 2 vols., Berlin, 1884; T. W. Rolleston, London, 1889; A. W. Ernst, Stuttgart, 1903; and *ADB*, xix. 756–802. Various phases of his literary and theological activities are discussed in: H. Ritter, *Ueber Lessing's philosophische und religiöse Grundsätze*, Göttingen, 1847; W. Beyschlag, *Lessings Nathan der Weise und das positive Christenthum*, Berlin, 1863; J. W. Loebell, *G. E. Lessing*, Brunswick, 1865 (deals with his relations to German literature); I. A. Dorner, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie*, pp. 721 sqq., Munich, 1867, Eng. transl., *Hist. of Protestant Theology*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1871; E. Niemeyer, *Ueber Lessings Pädagogik*, Dresden, 1874; T. W. H. Rolleston, *Lessing and Modern German Literature*, London, 1900; C. Sell, *Die Religion unserer Klassiker*, Tübingen, 1904; L. Zscharnak, *Lessing und Semler*, Giessen, 1905.

LESSIUS (LEYS), LEONARDUS: Jesuit theologian; b. at Brecht (14 m. n.e. of Antwerp), Belgium, Oct. 1, 1554; d. at Louvain Jan. 15, 1623. He studied at Louvain and entered the Society of Jesus in 1572. After teaching philosophy in the Jesuit College at Douai for seven years (1574–81) he devoted himself for four years to the study of theology in Rome and in 1585 became professor of theology at the Jesuit college at Louvain, remaining there till his death. In 1587 the theological faculty at Louvain attacked Lessius and Jean du Hamel, his colleague, censuring thirty-four theses extracted from their lectures, especially on the doctrines of inspiration, and grace and liberty. Lessius defended himself in *Sex antitheses* and *Responsio ad Antapologiam*. Against the Augustinian doctrine of grace, which was still upheld by the faculty of Louvain, Lessius denied the sole efficacy of grace. He also discarded the doctrine of inspiration and based the canonicity of the books of the Bible upon the subsequent testimony of the Spirit. But in spite of his liberal views he had no sympathy with any tendency or creed outside of the Roman Catholic Church. He was a versatile and prolific writer, and owed his chief fame to his comprehensive work on ethics, *De jure et institia ceterisque virtutibus cardinalibus libri iv.* (Louvain, 1605). Here he treats in the scheme of the four cardinal virtues all questions of ethics, political economy, natural law, etc., after the manner of Jesuit morals. He wrote also: *Defensio potestatis summi pontificis* (Saragossa, 1611); *Discussio decreti magni consilii Lateranensis et quarundam rationum annexarum de potestate ecclesiæ in temporalibus* (Mainz, 1613); *Hygiasticon seu de vera ratione valetudinis bonæ et vitæ una cum sensuum iudicii et memoriæ integritate ad extremam senectutem conservandæ* (Antwerp, 1613; Eng. transl., Cambridge, 1634). A collected edition of his works was published under the title *Opuscula quibus pleraque sacræ theologiæ mysteria explicantur et vitæ recte instituendæ præcepta traduntur* (Antwerp, 1623).

(R. Seeberg.)

Bibliography: H. Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius*, i. 245 sqq., Innsbruck, 1892; F. X. Linsenmann, *M. Baius und die Grundlegung des Jansenismus*, Tübingen, 1867; G. Schneemann, *Entstehung und Entwickelung der thomistisch-molinistischen Kontroverse*, Freiburg, 1879–80; idem, *Controversiarum de divina gratia liberi arbitrii concordia*, ib. 1881; *KL*, vii. 1844–51.

LESSON FOR THE DAY. See Pericope.

LESTINES, SYNOD OF. See Liftinæ, Synod of.

LE TELLIER, le tel''lyê', **MICHEL:** French Jesuit and confessor of Louis XIV.; b. near Vire (36 m. s.w. of Caen) Dec. 16, 1643; d. at La Flèche (24 m. s.s.w. of Le Mans) Sept. 2, 1719. He studied at the Jesuit college of Caen, and in 1661 entered the Society of Jesus. While teaching at the College Louis-le-Grand he became distinguished as a polemic theologian, especially against the Jansenists. In 1672 he published at Rouen his *Observations sur la version française du Nouveau Testament imprimée a Mons* (cf. Bible Versions, B, VI., § 4), and assisted Dominique Bouhours in translating the New Testament into French (1697). In support of the Jesuit principle of making certain concessions in order to convert the heathen, especially in China, he wrote *Defense des nouveaux chrétiens et des missionaires de la Chine, du Japon et des Indes* (2 vols., Paris, 1687); in his *Histoire des cinq propositions de Jansénius* (Liége, 1699), written under the pseudonym Dumas, he assailed Jansenism; and in his *Le Père Quesnel séditieux et hérétique* (Paris, 1705) he attacked Pasquier Quesnel (q.v.). Among his other works special mention should be made of his *Recueil des bulles sur les erreurs des deux derniers siècles* (Mons, 1697).

The services of Le Tellier won him the rank of a provincial of his order, and in 1709 he became the confessor of Louis XIV., over whom he exercised a profound influence against the Jansenists. To him the destruction of Port Royal was ultimately due, as was the resumption of efforts to suppress Protestantism. He was also a potent factor in securing the promulgation of the bull *Unigenitus*. With the death of Louis XIV. (1715), however, his influence was at an end, and the regency banished him from court, first to Amiens and later to La Flèche.

(Eugen Lachenmann.)

Bibliography: H. Reuchlin, *Geschichte von Port Royal*, ii. 589, 593, Hamburg, 1844; A. Dorsanne, *Journal*, 2 vols., Rome, 1753; H. J. V. de Saint-Simon, *Mémoires*, Paris, 1829; Ranke, *Popes*, ii. 437–438.

LETTERS DIMISSORY (*literæ dimissoriæ* or *dimissoriales*): The name of a document by which a person belonging to a certain ecclesiastical jurisdiction (diocese, congregation, etc.) is formally permitted to withdraw from the proper authority, either forever (*literæ dimissoriæ perpetuæ*), or for a particular purpose, such as ordination (*literæ dimissoriæ temporales*).

LEUSDEN, lʊs′den, **JOHANNES:** Dutch Biblical scholar; b. at Utrecht Apr. 26, 1624; d. there Sept. 30, 1699. He studied philosophy and theology, and especially Oriental languages at Utrecht, and then went to Amsterdam to perfect his knowledge by intercourse with Jews. In 1650 he became professor extraordinary of Oriental languages at Utrecht, and in 1653 ordinary professor. He was highly esteemed as an Orientalist, and as an academic teacher. Of his works may be mentioned: *Philologus Hebræus* (Utrecht, 1652); *Jonas illustratus* (1656); *Joël explicatus . . . adjunctus Obadja illustratus* (1657); *Philologus Hebræo-mixtus* (1663); *Psalterium Hebræum* (Amsterdam, 1666); *Clavis Græca Novi Testamenti* (Leyden, 1672); *Clavis Hebraica Veteris Testamenti* (1673); and *Korte Hebreusche en Chaldeusche taalkonst* (Utrecht, 1686). Leusden rendered valuable service to later editors by his edition of the Old Testament (Amsterdam, 1660; 2d ed., 1667), which he published in collaboration with Joseph Athias, a rabbi and printer in Amsterdam. His *Novum Testamentum Græcum* (Utrecht, 1675) has little scientific value.

(S. D. van Veen.)

Bibliography: C. Burman, *Trajectum eruditum, virorum doctrina inlustrium*, pp. 185–191, Utrecht, 1738; J. Fabricius, *Historia bibliothecæ Fabricianæ*, i. 244 sqq., Helmstadt, 1718; B. Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, ii. 365–367, 3 vols., 's Hertogenbosch, 1851–56; C. Sepp, *Het Godgeleerd Onderwijs in Nederland*, ii. 172–174, Leyden, 1874; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, viii. 195–196.

LEVELLERS: A faction with radical religious and political tendencies which appeared in Cromwell's army at the time of the break between the Independents and the Long Parliament (1647). Their aims were set forth by one of their number in *The Leveller, or the Principles and Maxims concerning Government and Religion of those commonly called Levellers* (London, 1658). These were in politics the supremacy of the law without regard to party, the legislative power of Parliament, the absolute equality of all before the law, and the right of bearing arms; in religion they sought freedom of conscience, liberty for each individual to act according to his best judgment, the recognition of two aspects of religion (one the correct understanding of revelation and a private matter, the other works of mercy and justice subject to the approval of mankind and the authorities), and the condemnation of all controversy on religious faith and practise. The sect vanished with many others at the Restoration. (C. Schoell†.)

Bibliography: S. H. Church, *Oliver Cromwell*, pp. 277–278, 306, 328, New York, 1897; *Encyclopædia Britannica*, i. 92, vi. 600. 602; and the literature on Cromwell.

LEVI, LEVITES.

- Origins (§ 1).
- Levites in the Priestly Document (§ 2).
- Character of Their Service (§ 3).
- Later Historical Notices (§ 4).
- Modern Criticism (§ 5).

In all sources Levi appears as one of the sons of Jacob, and in Gen. xxix. 34, xxxv. 23, and xlix. as the third son of Leah. Of Levi personally little is related outside of his union with Simeon in the cunning and cruel vengeance upon the Shechemites for dishonoring his sister Dinah and his consequent dispersion among the tribes according to the last oracle of Jacob (Gen. xxxix. 25 sqq., xlix. 5 sqq.).

1. Origins.

The fact that he had no inheritance among the tribes goes with his priestly calling and the high distinction he received under Moses. The question has been raised whether Levi was originally an individual and personal name (cf. Gen. xxix. 34, R.V. margin), and some modern scholars do not regard it as a tribal or local name but as derived from the vocation—"joined [to a sanctuary or a divinity]," "one devoted." Hommel cites such a usage of the word in Minæan inscriptions in connection with the god Wadd. But this usage is altogether foreign to Hebrew, and such a connection is absent in the unfavorable utterance of Jacob's last words, where there is no reference to the later honorable calling of the tribe. Wellhausen's view that Jacob's words refer to a tribe (not an individual) which early sank into insignificance while Deut. xxxiii. 8 sqq. blesses its priestly position is (apart from the otherwise unexplained naming of an unpriestly tribe) not so satisfactory as that under the same name quantitatively different conceptions are treated, since the Jacobic and Mosaic blessings are closely related. In Mosaic times the tribe came into a clearer light, inasmuch as Moses (q.v.) belonged to it and during the wandering it became the priestly tribe. This last is ascribed to two circumstances: first Moses made his brother Aaron priest of the sanctuary, and, second, for fidelity to the covenant the Levites received priestly consecration (Ex. xxxii. 29). The hereditary character of the Aaronic priesthood not only depends upon the setting apart of his sons as his helpers at the sanctuary and the promise of an everlasting priesthood in consequence of the faithfulness of the tribe (Ex. xxxii.; Num. xxv. 11 sqq.), but is in accordance with the Semitic usage which sets apart certain families for the care of sanctuaries.

2. Levites in the Priestly Document.

The priestly document describes the service of the tribe during the wandering as definitely ordered for the care of the sanctuary and its belongings. The period of service is given in Num. iv. 23, 30, as from the age of thirty to fifty, but in Num. viii. 24 sqq. as from twenty-five to fifty. Tradition regards this as dealing only with the period of the wandering, and affirms that at the age of fifty service did not cease, as at the sanctuary of Shiloh. The express statements of the priestly document concerning Levitical service deal in general with the time of the wandering. In this the consecration of the Levites, analogous to that of the priests, was to a lower grade of service, but signified a setting apart to Yahweh, and consisted of a sprinkling with water of expiation, a shaving of all hair from the body, and the washing of the clothing. Then followed the laying on of hands by the elders, the offering of the wave offering by the high priest and of a sin and burnt offering. A special clothing does not seem to have been appointed for them as it was for the priests (but cf. I Chron. xv. 27; II Chron. v. 12). There is lacking a description of their personal business and manner of life as opposed to the definite regulations for priestly living (Lev. xxi.), except that they were not possessors of land, in lieu of which they received part of the tithes of the people and of the booty of war (Num. xviii. 24 sqq., xxxi. 30; see TITHES). For their dwellings forty-eight cities were set apart, according to Num. xxxv., with definite dimensions in order that ground should be available for pasturage and support, a provision which does not do away with their exclusion from possession of land, since the cities were not inhabited exclusively by Levites (but cf. Lev. xxv. 32–33). The carrying out of this provision is given in Josh. xxi. (P), together with the setting apart of thirteen cities for the priests; of these cities six were cities of refuge. The idea of the systematic distribution of a tribe among all the other tribes presents that of a bond admirably adapted to preserve the conceptions of the theocracy, but seems rather ideal than real. The cities named were not in Israelitic possession till long after, and in the time of the Judges the Levites were in the position of strangers and guests.

3. Character of Their Service.

The tribe consisted of three families, those of Gershon, Kohath, and Merari (Gen. xlvi. 11; Ex. vi. 16), the sons of Levi, and these divided into eight branches. In Mosaic times the number of Levites is given as 22,000 (Num. iii. 39) or 23,000 (Num. xxvi. 62). The Chronicler traces a new arrangement for the Levite service back to David, who in connection with the placing of the ark in Jerusalem is said to have assigned to special duties the different families (I Chron. xxiii.–xxvii.), and the impression is given that this was in accord with prophetic direction. The objections made to this statement as a merely fanciful construction are answered by the fact that it has all the appearance of truth; the Chronicler might have attributed the assignment to Moses or Solomon were the representation purely hypothetical. It is evident that David and Solomon, the projector and builder of the temple, and the monarchs who organized the kingdom, must have given special attention to the Levites. It is wholly possible that at that time suitable persons from other tribes were incorporated among the Levites, though the tribal descent remained the basis of assignment. In David's time the number of Levites was 38,000 (I Chron. xxxiii. 3), of whom 24,000 were assigned to sanctuary service, 6,000 became officers and judges, 4,000 doorkeepers, and 4,000 were assigned to musical service. The class first named acted as assistants to the priests, cleansed the temple, prepared the offerings, and had general supervision of the sacred precincts. To this end a further division was made into twenty-four courses, corresponding to the same number of priestly courses. The officers and judges, taken from the family of Kohath, served outside the sanctuary and in great part outside Jerusalem. The musicians were also divided into twenty-four choirs, and among their leaders are mentioned sons of Asaph, Jeduthun, Heman, and Kohath. The doorkeepers, one of Korahitic descent and the rest of two families tracing their origin to Merari, guarded the four sides of the temple at twenty-four posts. The Nethinim (the word means "given over," *traditi*, cf. the *hierouloi* of Josephus, *Ant.* XI., v. 1; III Ezra, i. 3) were assigned to a service different from that of the Levites; in postexilic times they performed the menial services of the sanctuary, in preexilic times the heaviest duties, and their institution appears to have been one of high antiquity (compare the general service of the Gibeonites, Josh. ix. 21 sqq.). Prisoners of war under the kings who followed David were often assigned as temple slaves (Ezra viii. 20), and Solomon seems to have devoted to the same service some of the Canaanites (I Kings ix. 21; cf. Ezra ii. 58). During the continuance of the kingdom the service of the temple seems to have been in part performed even by uncircumcised persons (cf. Ezek. xliv. 7–8).

4. Later Historical Notices.

At the division of the kingdom, according to II Chron. xi. 13 sqq., many Levites flocked to Judah and Jerusalem from the kingdom of Israel. Levites accompanied the host on a war expedition under Jehoshaphat, and served at the same time as judges and teachers of the people (II Chron. xvii. 8, xix. 8, xx. 19 sqq.). Jehoiada employed them as an armed guard at the overthrow of Athaliah (II Chron. xxiii. 1–11, an office assigned in II Kings xi. 4–12 to the royal guard). To the Levites the Chronicler gives an important part in the reformation of Hezekiah (II Chron. xxix.), and tells of their services in the time of Josiah as slaughterers of the paschal lamb (II Chron. xxv. 11). Hezekiah is said to have reinstituted the giving of tithes, which had fallen into disuse, for the benefit of priests and Levites (II Chron. xxxi. 4), and the Chronicler gives a better character to the Levites than to the priests in that reign (II Chron. xxix. 34). Ezekiel (xliv. 9) expressly excludes them from priestly service on the ground that they had confirmed Israel in idolatry, and allows them to perform only the lower sanctuary services, assigning the altar service to the Zadokites. The effect of Ezekiel's legislation is that of an entirely new arrangement. That the Levites had fostered the high places is suggested by their fewness at the time of the return (Ezra ii. 40); only seventy-four Levites as against 4,289 priests were repatriated under Zerubbabel, though there appear 128 singers and 139 doorkeepers. These latter had been more closely attached to the temple, hence their greater interest in the return. Under Nehemiah the number of Levites in Jerusalem increased (Neh. xi. 15 sqq.). The Levitical cities are not mentioned in the period of Ezra–Nehemiah. Nethinim, regarded as a lower caste of the Levites, are mentioned as returning exiles, and they dwelt mainly in Jerusalem (Ezra ii. 58, vii. 7, 46). The Mishna (*Shekalim, Middot, Tamid*) preserves the tradition of the regulations affecting the service of the Levites at the second temple. After the destruction of the temple, the Levites and the priesthood lost their significance, since the synagogue did not need them, though in the ministrations of the synagogue Levites enjoyed a certain distinction. The employment of the name does not, however, involve descent from that tribe, since it was given to members of other tribes.

5. Modern Criticism.

Modern criticism has brought under review the prevalent tradition regarding the development of the Levites and their service. Since the sharp distinction between priests and Levites found in the priestly legislation does not appear in Deuteronomy, one school throws the latter book into a later time than the other sources of the Pentateuch, on the ground that the distinction had worn away. Another school, working upon the same distinction between priests and Levites and holding that in prophetic times this distinction was not existent, places the separation between the Aaronic priesthood and the liturgical Levites in the post-prophetic period. A separation indicated in II Kings xxiii. 8 sqq. is carried farther by Ezekiel and placed upon moral ground, when he reduces to the rank of serving Levites those who had engaged in idolatry (Ezek. xliv. 10). Then, according to this school, the priestly regulations were compiled in Babylon, brought by Ezra to Jerusalem, and there promulgated. In this the separation made between the priestly class and the Levites was dated back into Mosaic times. The Chronicler took up the matter and developed his history in accordance with the scheme of the priestly legislation. And the school whose teachings are here summarized finds these results illuminative of documentary history, and places the development in the order Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, the priestly legislation, the Chronicler.

If all historical worth is denied to the ordinances of the priest code, if the same position is taken in respect to the reports of the Chronicler and to such passages as I Sam. vi. 15, II Sam. xv. 24 and I Kings viii. 6, then there remains little concerning the Levites of preexilic times except subjective hypothesis. Of a priestly Levitic stock in early times nothing remains. In the time of the Judges and early kings there is no separation, so far as the cultus goes, between sacred and profane—Gideon, Manoah, and Saul sacrifice, and the Ephraimite Samuel becomes a priest, and so do David's sons (II Sam. viii. 18 R.V.). A numerous liturgical personnel, such as according to P the tribe of Levi must have had, nowhere appears in early times. Individuals assumed the functions of divine service, and later came to their exalted position as in Deut. xxxiii. But these are in part arbitrary assumptions. The sources indicate that the tribe of Levi belongs to the Mosaic period and was even then in sacred service. It is inconceivable that between this tribe and the priesthood there should have been no line of separation. The union between people and God depends upon a well-attested union of the cultus with one sanctuary and one priesthood, and the priesthood is traced in the Pentateuch to a family and not a tribe, though to the tribe during the wandering something of priestly consecration was given because of its fidelity to Yahweh. This does not involve that the Mosaic basis of the priestly legislation did not undergo in the course of time some modifications, while practical variations appeared from time to time, as has been indicated above. In quite early times the separation between sacred and profane began to fade out while the idea of a universal priesthood spread. So Judges xvii. furnishes an example of consecration of a profane person, who is later replaced by a Levite. Many sanctuaries may have existed without Levites in attendance. The systematic ordering of the temple service reintroduced the separation between sacred and profane, and Levitical priests were entrusted with the sanctuary service. In the popular view each Levite had the reversion to the priestly office. The Levites of the temple were so distinguished that for ordinary menial functions lower servants were provided, and were brethren of the priests. This is the Deuteronomic position. The conclusion so frequently drawn from II Kings xxiii. 9 and Deut. xviii. 6 sqq. that the priests of Jerusalem resisted the attempt of Josiah to install there the priests of the high places is not justified; all that is deducible is that Levitic origin alone was not considered sufficient ground for their serving as priests.

C. von Orelli.

Bibliography: The subject is so essentially involved in the criticism of the Pentateuch that, at least for the critical side and largely also for the historical data, reference to the literature on the Pentateuch (Hexateuch) is necessary. It is also discussed in treatises on the history of Israel (see under Ahab), on Hebrew archeology and the theology of the O. T. Consult also: E. Riehm, *Die Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab*, pp. 31 sqq., Gotha, 1854; J. J. Stähelin, in *ZDMG*, ix (1855), 708 sqq.; J. Orth, in *Nouvelle Revue de theologie*, iii (1859), 384 sqq.; K. H. Graf, in *Archiv für . . . Erforschung des A. T.*, i (1867–69), 68–106, 208–236; A. Kuenen, *Godsdienst van Israel*, ii. 104 sqq., Harlem, 1870, Eng. transl., London, 1875; S. I. Curtiss, *The Levitical Priests*, Edinburgh, 1877; S. Maybaum, *Die Entwickelung des altisraelitischen Priestertums*, Breslau, 1880; R. Smend, *Die Listen der Bücher Esra und Nehemia*, Basel, 1881; W. H. Green, *Moses and the Prophets*, New York, 1882 (maintains the traditional view); W. W. von Baudissin, *Die Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Priesterthums*, Leipsic, 1889; C. Piepenbring, in *RHR*, xxiv (1891), 1–60, 133–186 (summarizes the Reuss-Wellhausen theory); E. Meyer, *Die Entstehung des Judentums*, pp. 168–183, Halle, 1896; A. van Hoonacker, *Le Sacerdoce levitique*, Louvain, 1899; F. von Hummelauer, *Das vormosaische Priesterthum in Israel*, Freiburg, 1899; J. Köberle, *Die Tempelsänger*, Erlangen, 1899; J. E. Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby, *The Composition of the Hexateuch*, London, 1902. Smith, *OTJC;* Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. 237–242, 271–279, Eng. transl., II., i. 223–229, 265–273; *DB*, iii. 99–102, iv. 67–97 (not to be overlooked); *EB*, iii. 2770–2776, 3837–47; *JE*, viii. 19–21, 49–50.

LEVIRATE MARRIAGE. See Family and Marriage Relations, Hebrew, § 12.

LEVITICUS. See Hexateuch.

LEWIS, ABRAM HERBERT: Seventh Day Baptist; b. at Scott, N. Y., Nov. 17, 1836; d. at Watch Hill, R. I., Nov. 4, 1908. He studied at Ripon College, Ripon, Wis., Milton College, Milton, Wis. (B.A., 1861), Alfred University, Alfred Centre,

N. Y. (M.A., 1863), Alfred Theological Seminary (graduated 1863), and Union Theological Seminary (1870–71). He was pastor at Westerly, R. I., 1864–67 and New York City 1867–69; general agent of the American Sabbath Tract Society 1869–73; pastor at Shiloh, N. J., 1873–76; professor of church history and homiletics at Alfred University 1876–1880; pastor at Plainfield, N. J., 1880–96. From 1896 until his death he was corresponding secretary of the American Sabbath Tract Society and editor of *The Sabbath Recorder*. He was editor of *The Outlook and Sabbath Quarterly* 1882–94, and was corresponding editor of *The Philanthropist*. In theology he was a liberal orthodox adherent of his Church. He wrote: *Sabbath and Sunday* (Alfred Centre, N. Y., 1870); *Biblical Teachings concerning the Sabbath and the Sunday* (1884); *Critical History of the Sabbath and the Sunday in the Christian Church* (1886); *Critical History of Sunday Legislation from 321 to 1888 A. D.* (New York, 1888); *Paganism Surviving in Christianity* (1890); *Swift Decadence of Sunday; What Next?* (Plainfield, N. J., 1899); and *Letters to Young Preachers and their Readers* (1900).

LEWIS, TAYLER: Reformed Dutch lay Biblical scholar and author; b. at Northumberland, Saratoga County, N. Y., Mar. 27, 1802; d. at Schenectady, N. Y., May 11, 1877. After graduating from Union College in 1820 he studied law and began to practise at Fort Miller in 1824. Having become interested in Biblical and classical studies he gave up the law and in 1833 opened a classical school at Waterford, N. Y., which he moved to Ogdensburg in 1835. He was professor of Greek in New York University 1838–49, and from 1849 till his death professor of Greek and instructor in Oriental languages and Biblical literature at Union College. He was a member of the Dutch Reformed Church. He was an able apologete and a prominent exponent of Oriental and classical studies. His more important works are: *Plato contra Atheos* (New York, 1845), being the Greek text of the tenth book of the dialogue on laws, with luminous notes and discussions; *An Essay on the Ground and Reason of Punishment with Special Reference to the Penalty of Death* (1846); *The Six Days of Creation* (Schenectady, 1855); *The Bible and Science* (1856); *The Divine Human in the Scriptures* (New York, 1860); *State Rights, a Photograph from the Ruins of Ancient Greece* (Albany, 1864); and *The Light by which we see Light* (Vedder lectures, New York, 1875). He also translated and supplemented the notes on Genesis for Schaff's edition of Lange's commentary (1868), and prepared for the same work metrical versions of Job and Ecclesiastes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. Wells, in the *Methodist Quarterly*, xxxviii (1878), 604 sqq.

LEWIS, WILSON SEELEY: Methodist Episcopal bishop; b. at Russell, N. Y., July 17, 1857. He was educated at St. Lawrence University, N. Y., and Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Ia. (B.A., 1889), after which he was principal of Epworth Seminary, Epworth, Ia., until 1897 and president of Morningside College, Sioux City, Ia., until 1908, in which year he was elected a bishop of his denomination.

LEYDECKER, lai′dek-er, **MELCHIOR:** Dutch Protestant; b. at Middelburg Mar. 11, 1642; d. at Utrecht Jan. 6, 1721. After serving for fifteen years as pastor in different places of Zealand he became professor of theology in Utrecht in 1679 and labored there till his death. He was perhaps the last representative of strict Reformed orthodoxy. From his orthodox standpoint he wrote polemical works against Balthasar Becker, the Cartesians, Hermann Witsius, and especially against the federal theology of the Cocceians. His principal works are: *De œconomia trium personarum in negotio salutis humanæ* (Utrecht, 1682); *Synopsis controversiarum de fœdere et testamento Dei* (1690); *Commentarius in Catech. Heidelberg. sive de veritate et sanctitate fidei Reformatæ* (1694); and *De republica Hebræorum* (2 vols., Amsterdam, 1704–10).

(E. F. KARL MÜLLER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. J. van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden*, xi. 387 sqq., Haarlem, 1852 sqq.; *Sammlung von alten und neuen theologischen Sachen*, pp. 1012 sqq., Leipsic, 1721; F. W. J. H. Gass, *Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik*, iii. 290, Berlin, 1862.

LEYSER, lâi′zer (**LEISER, LYSER**): A family of Lutheran theologians and learned men, which in the sixteenth century removed from Swabia to North Germany, where its descendants are still flourishing.

1. Caspar Leyser: The oldest known member of the family, was born at Winnenden (12 m. n.e. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, c. 1527; d. at Nürtingen (13 m. s.s.e. of Stuttgart) 1554 or 1555. He entered the University of Tübingen in 1541, in 1550 became pastor in his native city, and in 1553 at Nürtingen. He joined his brother-in-law, Jakob Andreä, in a proposal to Duke Christopher of Württemberg to introduce a church discipline modeled after Calvin's and "presbyteries," i.e., church courts for the correction of offenders. The duke received the proposal favorably, but Brenz and the secular councilors opposed it, and it was not carried into effect.

2. Polycarp Leyser (the Elder): Only son of Caspar Leyser, was born at Winnenden Mar. 18, 1552; d. at Dresden Feb. 22, 1610. In 1570 he became master and repetent at Tübingen, and in 1573 preacher at Gellersdorf in Lower Austria, whence he was frequently called to preach at Vienna and thus became known to Emperor Maximilian II. After declining a call to Graz, in 1577 he became pastor, superintendent, and theological professor at Wittenberg. Here the ungrateful task devolved upon him of pacifying the excitement prevailing since the overthrow of the Cryptocalvinists in 1574 and of assisting in the introduction of the Formula of Concord as well as in the reorganization of the university. His modesty, amiability, and oratorical talents soon won the respect and love of his congregation, of the university, and of the elector. He was active in the final arrangement of the Book of Concord (1577–80), in the reform of the university, and the revision of Luther's translation of the Bible. In 1582 he attended the colloquy of Quedlinburg (see CHEMNITZ, MARTIN, § 3), in 1583 a synod at Dresden, in 1584 and 1585 conventions at Magdeburg, Leipsic, and Herzberg. When the Philippists regained the ascendency after the death of Elector Augustus in 1586, Leyser went to Brunswick as vice-superintendent. Here new struggles awaited him since Superintendent Heidenreich confuted the doctrine of Ubiquity (q.v.) as laid down in the Formula of Concord. The majority of the congregation and preachers took Leyser's part and Heidenreich was deposed to make way for Leyser (1589). Professor Daniel Hoffmann of Helmstädt, however, renewed the attack, and vehement discussions ensued until Leyser was recalled to Wittenberg (1593) after the death of Elector Christian I. and the rapid overthrow of Cryptocalvinism. He at once became involved in the controversy there over the teachings of Samuel Huber (q.v.). In 1594 he went to Dresden as court preacher and councilor of the consistory.

Leyser's most important works are the edition of the *Loci theologici* of Martin Chemnitz (Frankfurt, 1592) and his continuation of the same author's *Harmonia evangelica* (1593). He also wrote commentaries on Genesis, Daniel, the minor prophets, and other books of the Bible. The greatest sensation was stirred up by his polemical treatise against the Calvinists, *Ob, wie, und warum man lieber mit den Papisten Gemeinschaft haben . . . soll denn mit und zu den Calvinisten*, originally an introduction to his *Christianismus, Papismus et Calvinismus, das ist drey unterschiedliche Auslegungen des Catechismi Lutheri* (1595; republished by Leyser's successor, Hoë von Hoënegg, 1620; cf. Tholuck, pp. 115 sqq.).

3. Polycarp Leyser (II.): Elder son of Polycarp Leyser (the Elder), was born at Wittenberg Nov. 20, 1586; d. in Leipsic Jan. 15, 1633. He was professor at Wittenberg and Leipsic and later was entrusted with high ecclesiastical positions. He took part in various theological proceedings and disputes and wrote commentaries on Galatians, on the Augsburg Confession, and on the Formula of Concord; also polemical treatises, sermons, and disputations.

4. Wilhelm Leyser: Younger son of Polycarp Leyser (the Elder), was born in Dresden 1592; d. in Wittenberg Feb. 8, 1649. He was superintendent at Torgau and professor at Wittenberg, and wrote a *Summarium locorum theologicorum*, a *Systema thetico-exegeticum*, a *Trifolium veræ religionis veteris testamenti Adamiticæ, Abrahamiticæ, Israeliticæ*, and other works.

5. Johannes Leyser: Son of Polycarp Leyser (II.) was born at Leipsic Sept. 30, 1631; d. near Paris, 1685. He was for a time pastor and inspector in Schulpforta, Prussian Saxony, and in several writings defended polygamy, which cost him his position.

6. Polycarp Leyser (III.): Grandson of Polycarp Leyser (II.), was born at Halle July 1, 1656; d. at Celle (23 m. n. of Hanover) Oct. 11, 1725. He was assessor of the philosophical faculty at Leipsic, later pastor at Magdeburg, superintendent at Wunstorf and after 1708 general superintendent at Celle. He rendered great services to the memory of his great-grandfather.

(Johannes Kunze.)

Bibliography: 1. C. F. Sattler, *Geschichte des Herzogthums Württemberg*, iv. 74, and appendixes 29–30, 10 vols., Ulm, 1769–79; C. F. Schnurrer, *Erläuterungen der württembergischen Kirchen-Reformations- und Gelehrten-Geschichte*, pp. 234 sqq., Tübingen, 1798; C. F. von Stälin, *Württembergische Geschichte*, iv. 738–739, Stuttgart, 1870.

2. One of Leyser's own tracts, useful as material, was given by his great-grandson W. E. Tentzel in *Curieuse Bibliothec*, 1705, ii. 675–735; a selection of his letters was issued by another great-grandson, P. Leyser III., *Sylloge epistolarum Leyser*, i. 1706; and contemporary material was used by M. Adam, in *Vitae theologorum*, pp. 379–381, Frankfort, 1706. Consult P. J. Rethmeyer, *Braunschweigische Kirchenhistorie*, iv. 23 sqq., 55–149, Brunswick, 1715; A. Tholuck, *Der Geist der lutherischen Theologen Wittenbergs*, pp. 4–14, Gotha, 1852; a careful sketch, founded on early data, is given in J. A. Gleich, *Annales ecclesiastici*, i. 439–609, Dresden, 1730.

L'HÔPITAL lō″pî″tāl′ **(L'HOSPITAL), MICHEL DE:** Chancellor of France; b. at Aigueperse (80 m. n.w. of Lyons), Auvergne, 1504; d. on his estate at Vignay, near Étampes (30 m. s.s.w. of Paris) Mar. 13, 1573. L'Hôpital, who was of a noble family from Auvergne, studied law at Padua (1525–31), where the last year he lectured on civil law as professor extraordinarius. After spending a year in Rome as member of the papal court of justice called "Della Rota," he came to Paris where for three years he worked hard as a barrister and (1537) gained a seat in the Paris parliament. Henceforth his career became more and more successful. He was sent (1547) as a delegate to the Council of Trent which had been transferred to Bologna. He was appointed (1553) by Margaret, the future duchess of Savoy, first as chancellor of the duchy, then (1554–59) lord of the exchequer. At last (1560) he became chancellor and keeper of the seal in France. In the first-mentioned office he had distinguished himself as a fair, impartial judge, and as chancellor (1560–68), in the midst of the most confused period of the history of France, he displayed the talents of a statesman. He became the leader of the "Modérés" who then were very few and he followed inflexibly his own ideals. He formulated the edict (Jan. 17, 1562) by which, although it forbade the Protestants to build churches, they could hold their meetings outside the walls of cities under the protection of the law. This restricted toleration, became the fundamental law, and decided the legal position of Protestants as affected by all other edicts.

He could not prevent the outbreak of the civil war (which began with the massacre of Vassy, 1562), but in the frequent negotiations, as for instance in the Treaty of Amboise (Mar. 19, 1563), his influence was felt. The same influence remained powerful till the Council of Trent, which by its decrees separated definitely the two denominations. But through his advice, these decrees were not accepted in France (Feb., 1564) and once more his conciliatory spirit can be traced in the Treaty of Longjumeau (Mar. 23, 1568). From that date he withdrew from his charge as councilor and left the court for Vignay. He was formally discharged from his post as chancellor (Feb. 6, 1573), but all his titles with their income were left to him. Faure and others edited his *Epistolæ* (Paris, 1585); and Dufey his *Œuvres* (1624–26, 5 vols.).

G. Bonet-Maury.

Bibliography: P. Bayle, *Dictionary, Historical and Critical*, iii. 505–517, London, 1736; M. J. A. N. Caritat, *Éloge de M. l'Hôpital*, Paris, 1777, cf. his *Éloges des Académiciens*, vol. v., ib. 1799; E. Dupré-Lasalle, in *Le Droit*, March and June, 1858; idem, *Michel de l'Hospital*, Paris, 1899; A. H. Taillandier, *Nouvelles recherches historiques sur la vie de . . . L'Hôpital*, Paris, 1861; A. F. Villemain, *Études d'hist. moderne; vie de L'Hôpital*, ib. 1862; P. D. L., *Éclaircissement historique et généalogique sur L'Hôpital et sa famille*, Clermont-Ferrand, 1862; H. Amphoux, *M. de L'Hôpital et la liberté de conscience au xvi. siècle*, Paris, 1900; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, vi. 366–374.

LIAFWINE. See Lebwin.

LIBANIUS li-bê'ni-ʋs: One of the latest and most important of the Greek sophists; b. at Antioch 314; d. there c. 395. He studied for four years at Athens, then opened a school at Constantinople, where his lectures became so popular that in 343 rival teachers of rhetoric secured his expulsion from the city on a charge of "magic." After teaching for five years in Nicomedia he returned to Constantinople, but, finding his adversaries in the ascendency, he finally settled in Antioch in 354. He was an intimate friend of the Emperor Julian, who corresponded with him. He was a teacher of Basil the Great and Chrysostom, and maintained friendly relations with them throughout life. His works consist of declamations, orations, a life of Demosthenes, an autobiography, and letters, of which there are no less than 1,607 extant. The letters were edited by C. H. Wolf (Amsterdam, 1738), the declamations and orations by J. J. Reiske (4 vols., Altenburg, 1791–97). A few of his writings, including sixteen letters to Julian, were translated by J. Duncombe and published in *Select Works of the Emperor Julian* (2 vols., London, 1784). His funeral oration on Julian, in English translation, is in C. W. King's *Julian the Emperor* (London, 1888).

Bibliography: L. Petit, *Essai sur la vie et la correspondance du sophist Libanius*, Paris, 1866; G. R. Sievers, *Das Leben des Libanius*, Berlin, 1868; A. Gardner, *Julian Philosopher and Emperor*, London, 1895; G. Negri, *Julian, the Apostate*, passim, New York, 1903 (valuable).

LIBELLATICI. See Lapsed.

LIBER COMICUS. See Pericope, §§ 5–6.

LIBER DIURNUS ROMANORUM PONTIFICUM: A collection of formularies used at Rome in connection with the principal ecclesiastical functions, such as the coronation of a pope, the consecration of the suburbicarian bishops, the granting of the pallium or of special privileges. Based mainly upon the letters of Gelasius I. and Gregory I., the book took shape between 685 and 751. It was used down to the eleventh century, in fact individual formularies are found from it in the collections of canons made in the twelfth, as in Gratian; but after that period, being no longer applicable to the altered position of the Roman see, it fell into disuse and oblivion. It was rediscovered by Lucas Holste (q.v.) in a manuscript belonging to the Cistercian library of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme at Rome. He was preparing to publish it in 1650, after collation with another version sent him by Sirmond from the Collège de Clermont, when the Roman censorship forbade him, and he died in 1661 without gaining permission. The ground of this refusal was the "profession of faith" contained in it, to be made by each pope on taking office, which included a declaration of assent to the decrees of the sixth general council and a repudiation of the heresies condemned by it, mentioning Honorius I. among the supporters of the latter. The book was published by the Jesuit Garnier in 1680 at Paris, and Mabillon, who on his visit to Rome examined the manuscript found by Holste, and gave extracts from it in his *Museum Italicum.* Garnier's edition was reprinted by Hofmann (Leipsic, 1733) and Riegger (Vienna, 1762); and an edition meeting the requirements of modern scholarship was published by Eugène de Rozière (Paris, 1869), including the necessary textual apparatus and the notes of Garnier, Baluze, and Zaccaria. This edition is based on a collation by Daremberg and Renan of the Vatican manuscript, then still supposed to be the only one extant, which according to Mabillon belongs to the latter half of the ninth century. Von Sickel then published another edition (Vienna, 1889) which contained important new results, denying the unity of the composition and taking somewhat different views as to its date. But he was unaware that the Ambrosian Library at Milan contains another manuscript, so that his conclusions can not be accepted as final. In the centuries following the eleventh, attempts were made to supply the place of the old book, which was now no longer serviceable, and collections are extant in manuscript under the titles *Literæ quæ in curia domini papæ dari consueverunt* and *Stylus scriptorum curiæ Romanæ*, extending from John XXII. to Gregory XII. and John XXIII.

(J. F. von Schulte.)

Bibliography: Consult, besides the prolegomena and discussions in the editions named in the text, Sickel, *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie, philosophisch-historische Klasse*, vol. cxvii.; *KL*, vii. 1881–86; F. Palacký, *Ueber Formelbücher*, Prague, 1842.

Original Form.

LIBER PONTIFICALIS: The *Liber pontificalis* contains the history of the popes from St. Peter down, in the form of biographies. The oldest work bearing this title, to which it is most properly applied, comes down to Stephen V. (885–891), with the omission of the three predecessors of this pope, John VIII., Marinus II., and Adrian III.; the text of the extant manuscripts stops midway in the life of Stephen V., so that it is not possible to say how it originally terminated. As to its origin various opinions have been entertained. In the Middle Ages, on the ground of the letters of Damasus and Jerome appended to it, Damasus was supposed to be the author. The Humanists (e.g., Onofrio Panvinio) were more critical, and conjectured Anastasius, librarian of Nicholas I.; though this hypothesis was refuted by the Vatican librarian, Emanuel Schelstrate (in his *Dissertatio de antiquis Romanorum pontificum catalogis*, Rome, 1692), as well as by G. G. Ciampini (*Examen libri pontificalis*, ib. 1688) and by F. Bianchini in his edition of the *Liber pontificalis* (ib. 1718 sqq.). Duchesne has proved that the lives were the products of a gradual evolution; and the only debatable question is now as to the date of its original compilation. The decision depends on the question of its sources.

Sources and Date.

The names and dates of the lives are drawn demonstrably from two sources. One is the *Catalogus Liberianus*, a list of popes ending with Liberius (352–366). This is a part of the *Chronographus anni 354*, the well-known Roman state calendar, and is taken, down to 235 (Pontianus), from the *Liber generationis* of Hippolytus, and later from church calendars.

The second list is handed down in different forms of various length, but these may all be traced back to a single clearly distinguishable archetype (designated by Mommsen as *Index*). The first compiler adhered in the main to the *Catalogus Liberianus*, because this is more explicit in relation to the earlier times; and only from Liberius down is the *Index* the sole source for the dates. At all events, a collation is possible down to Sixtus III. (d. 440), through data from Prosper's *Chronicon*, which exhibits an agreement in dates. The student of papal chronology will naturally turn, not to the *Liber pontificalis* but to its sources, as the former is merely a secondary authority. Indeed, even the other historical matter of the older portion is derived from other works. Their number is very great, their value generally very small; so that the historical statements are untrustworthy down to about the time of Anastasius II. (496–498). A single exception may be made in favor of the enumeration of buildings erected and gifts made by the popes, doubtless dating back to the substance of papal archives, and constituting the best feature of the oldest portion. From Anastasius II. the accounts of the political history of the popes become more trustworthy. In this way there is obtained a criterion for deciding the question as to the age of the first compilation. It is safe to conclude with Duchesne, against Mommsen, that the oldest form of the *Liber pontificalis* dates from the beginning of the sixth century; a deduction favored not only by the fact that the lives of the early sixth century afford superior historical matter, but also by the existence of an extract, ending with the life of Felix IV. (526–530), the so-called *Catalogus Felicianus*. Possibly this may afford ground for referring the original compilation to the time of Boniface II., successor to Felix IV. This first edition then came to serve as pattern for a whole series of others, e.g., an edition closing with the life of Conon (d. 687), the existence of which is attested by an abstract, ending with Conon (*Catalogus Cononianus*), and by the list of popes, likewise ending with Conon, of the earliest manuscript of the *Liber pontificalis*, dating from the close of the seventh century. Another recension closed with Constantine I. (d. 715), and still others with Stephen II. (d. 757), Stephen III. (d. 772), and Adrian I. (d. 795). From the sixth century down, the biographies were for the most part begun in the lifetime of their subjects. Specially noteworthy in this respect are the lives of Gregory II. (715–731), Valentine (827), and Sergius II. (844–847). The life of Gregory II. was used by Bede (q.v.) as a source for his chronicle, and thus must certainly have been begun before the death of this pope. The life of Valentine contains very full particulars of his birth, education, election and virtues; but as he died only a few days after his election, it must have been written immediately upon his elevation. The life of Sergius II. begins with fulsome praise of his virtues, then suddenly breaks off: the virtuous pope becomes the direct opposite, and exaggerated praise turns to vehement censure; so that we may suppose that the first portion was composed in his lifetime, the second after his death. Owing to this contemporary composition, the *Liber pontificalis* is one of the most valuable sources for the history of those centuries. It is true that in consequence of the official character of the compilation—the biographies are all composed by officers of the papal household—a certain fixed terminology is noticeable, especially in the later lives, which notably prevails in the forms of intròduction and conclusion, as well as in stereotyped phrases for describing the pope's personality; but still the careful student will know how to appreciate the work, despite its defects, as an excellent witness respecting the conceptions and standpoint of the papal court. In this period, if at all, the work of Anastasius Bibliothecarius (q.v.) must have been done.

Continuations.

The old *Liber pontificalis* stops at the close of the ninth century. For the tenth and eleventh, there exist only meager lists of popes. The Hildebrandine epoch produced the great biographies of Leo IX. and Gregory VII. Bonizo of Sutri, in his *Liber ad amicum*, interweaves the history of the popes from Leo IX. to Gregory VII. in the style of the early *Liber pontificalis*, summarizes, in the fourth book of his *Decretals*, the papal history to Stephen V., and gives an outline as far as Urban II. Cardinal Beno writes the history of Gregory VII.; the compilers of *Annales Romani* give the history of the years 1044–73, 1111, 1116–21. But none of these are continuations of the early *Liber pontificalis*. It was not till the twelfth century that definite continuations were undertaken. One of these, described by Duchesne as the *Liber pontificalis* of Pierre Guillaume (though more correctly termed of Pandulph from its author, a cardinal of the party of the Antipope Anacletus II.) is a partizan tract in favor of Anacletus. From Peter to Adrian II. he copies the old *Liber pontificalis;* from John VIII. to the end of the eleventh century, a papal catalogue. He takes the biographies of Gregory VII. and Urban II. from the records of these popes; and only with Paschal II. does he begin a vivid portraiture of his contemporaries: it is probable that the life of Paschal II. is by another (unknown) author, as it shows a different style from that which follows, and especially lacks the peculiar cadence of the papal documents, the so-called *Cursus Leoninus*, conspicuous in the subsequent biographies. On the other hand, the lives of Gelasius II., Calixtus II., Honorius II., are certainly Pandulph's. Written as a partizan tract, this work fell into oblivion after the death of Anacletus II.; nor was it employed until the end of the fourteenth century, when a Frenchman, Pierre

Bohier, transcribed and glossed it, and dedicated it to Charles V. of France. Of greater literary importance is the second continuation, Cardinal Boso's *Liber pontificalis*, written c. 1178. This begins where the older one stopped, with Stephen V., and thus stamps itself as a direct continuation. By way of introduction, Boso utilizes the brief outline of the papal history which Bonizo of Sutri included in the fourth book of his *Decretals*. He takes the first part, from John XII. to Gregory VII., word for word from Bonizo's *Liber ad amicum*, omitting Urban II. and Victor III. In the case of Paschal II. he draws on the archives; from Gelasius II. he gives his own narrative, employing a wealth of documents easily accessible to him as camerarius of the apostolic see. This continuation, because incomplete, was not fused with the early *Liber pontificalis*, but gained significance in connection with the *Liber censuum* of the Church of Rome; for since Boso had most probably undertaken to write a *Liber censuum*, it was a natural supposition that his collection of biographies was designed to serve as introduction to that work. In this connection, the work was repeatedly copied, the best-known edition being that of Cardinal Nicholas Roselli, in the middle of the fourteenth century, which was diffused in countless manuscripts all over the world. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, although private works in the sphere of papal history for this period are common enough, including lists of popes, particular biographies (Innocent III., Gregory IX., Innocent IV., Gregory X., Celestine V.), papal chronicles (Bernardus Guidonis, Ptolemy of Lucca, Amalricus Augerius de Biterris, Petrus de Herentals, etc.), there was no thought of continuing the *Liber pontificalis*. Not until the beginning of the fifteenth century, and anonymously, was the attempt made; but the author is thoroughly dependent, copying the work of Pandulph, with a continuation taken word for word from the chronicle of Martinus Polonus, while from Martin IV. (1281) to John XXII. (1328) he copies the chronicle of Bernardus Guidonis. A more meritorious continuation, likewise anonymous, dates from the middle of the same century. In general the author copied the work just mentioned down to 1328; he took the last part of the life of John XXII. and those of the three following popes (Benedict XII., Clement VI., Innocent VI.) from a continuation of Bernardus Guidonis, and wrote an independent continuation from Urban V. to Martin V. (1362–1431). This, however, is rather a history of the great schism than a *Liber pontificalis*. This edition was soon afterward copied again, and expanded by extracts from Martinus Polonus and Bernardus Guidonis. Two other continuations of the fifteenth century were never combined with the *Liber pontificalis*, though their entire scope entitles them to be regarded as continuations. One extends from Benedict XII. to Martin V. (1334–1431), and contains, especially in respect to the history of Boniface IX., Innocent VI., and Gregory XII., more ample information than the continuation dating from the middle of the fifteenth century, as well as more candid verdicts upon the personal characters and transactions of the popes described. It appears in a Vatican manuscript with the additional biography of Eugenius IV. The second continuation begins with Urban VI. and extends to Pius II. (1378–1464), evidently an unfinished work.

Of all these later works, the only ones of literary importance toward the close of the Middle Ages were the continuation dating from the middle of the fifteenth century, and that of Boso. Both works were soon supplanted by the *Liber de vita Christi ac de vitis summorum pontificum Romanorum* of Platina, librarian of Pope Sixtus IV. (Venice, 1479). He transformed the early *Liber pontificalis* and its continuations into a book which even Humanists could read with pleasure, and thus drove the other continuations from the field. It was not until the beginning of the seventeenth century that attention was again turned to the old *Liber pontificalis*. At this time it was first printed, and has since, in its turn, caused Platina's book to be forgotten.

A. BRACKMANN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The two editions which are of superlative worth are (1) L. Duchesne, 2 vols., Paris, 1886–92, and (2) T. Mommsen, in *MGH*, *Gest. pont. Rom.*, vol. i., Berlin, 1898. Other editions are mentioned and a list of the best literature prior to 1896 is given in Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 737–739 (not to be overlooked). Further matter of importance is to be found in: I. Chapman, in *Revue bénédictine*, xviii (1901), 399–417; T. Lindner, in *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, xii (1872), 235–250, 656 sqq.; P. Fabre, in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, vol. vi., Rome, 1886; idem, *Étude sur le Liber censuum de l'église romaine*, Paris, 1892; J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, part I., *S. Clement of Rome*, i. 201–345, London, 1890; F. H. Glassschröder, in *Römische Quartalschrift für Alterthumskunde*, iv. 125 sqq., v. 178; idem, in *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, xi (1890), 240–266; T. Mommsen, in *NA*, xix (1894), 285–293, xxi (1896), 333–357, xxii (1897), 545–553; Sägmüller, in *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, xv (1894), 802–810; F. G. Rosenfeld, *Ueber die Komposition des Liber pontificalis*, Marburg, 1896; I. Giorgi, in *Archivio della società Romana di storia patria*, xx (1897), 247 sqq.; A. Harnack, in *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1892, pp. 761–778; H. Griser, *Analecta Romana*, Rome, 1899.

LIBER SEXTUS. See CANON LAW, II., 6, § 3.

LIBER VITÆ (DIPTYCHS): The official register of the members of the congregation, also a list of the clergy, and others. The establishment of such a register was inseparably connected with the rise of the ecclesiastical organization. Baptism, which consummated the entrance into the congregation, occasioned at once the necessity and the right of enrolment; death, voluntary withdrawal, or expulsion by way of discipline, caused erasure. Besides this there were special lists of the clergy and of other persons in the service or under the care of the Church. The more complicated the apparatus of ecclesiastical government and administration became, the more these registers increased in number and in size. A special group was formed by the lists, with the names of the spiritual and temporal rulers, which were read aloud during the supplications, and also by those containing the names of persons who participated in the eucharistic offerings or who deserved mention for some other reason. These may all be included under the general designation " book of life," " book of the living," in which may be seen a connection with expressions in the Bible (cf. Rev. iii. 5, xiii. 8; Phil. iv. 3; Ps. lxix. 28). Purely external considerations gave rise to the opposite designation "book of the dead," originally referring only to those whose memory was recalled at the communion service. The development of worship, both in the Eastern and in the Western Church, combined with the growing length of the lists, led to the abandonment or the restriction of the older custom.

As to the form of this register, the Greek name *diptychon* implies a connection with the wax tablets used by the ancients. Two or more of them were bound together, in the form of a book, the exterior being of some firm material and forming the covers. At the same period papyrus rolls were also used. These covers were probably in most cases of wood. Nevertheless, in the fourth century and probably earlier, ivory was used and ornamented with reliefs.

Probably the oldest (fourth to fifth century?) Christian example which has been preserved is the Carrand diptych in Florence with the naming of the beasts of the field by Adam; but, in general, scenes from the New Testament predominate.

The use of diptychs continued in the East far into the Middle Ages, and the same is true of the West, especially in the period of Carlovingian art. Some of the diptych tablets have been preserved as ornamental parts of book-covers; for the artistic ecclesiastical bindings of the Middle Ages were inspired by the diptychs.

From these diptychs, with religious representations, in ecclesiastical use must be distinguished those of the officials, of the emperors, and of private persons. These should not, however, pass unnoticed since some of them show Christian types, while others were taken for ecclesiastical use and were altered for that purpose. In this group the first place is occupied by the diptych of the Consul Anicius Probus, from the year 406, in the possession of the Cathedral of Aosta. One tablet shows the emperor holding in his left hand the imperial orb with a winged Victory, and in his right the labarum, inscribed with the words "In the name of Christ conquer thou ever." Another important example is the Barberini diptych in the Louvre, with the equestrian figure of Justinian. On one leaf of a diptych in Monza the costume of the consul has been changed into a priestly vestment and the head has been given the tonsure; an inscription has also been added indicating that the figure is that of Gregory the Great. On the other leaf, the original figure is untouched and it has been given another meaning only by means of the inscription "King David." There is in Bologna a private diptych Christianized by the addition of an inscription designating the principal figure as Peter and a bust above this figure as Mark.

It may also be remarked that the various forms of the altar-piece are called diptych, triptych, etc.

Victor Schultze.

Bibliography: Earlier works still of value are: C. A. Salig, *De diptychis veterum*, Halle, 1731; A. F. Gori, *Thesaurus veterum diptychorum*, 3 vols., Florence, 1759; J. O. Westwood, *Description of the Ivories, Ancient and Mediæval, in the South Kensington Museum*, London, 1876; R. Garrucci, *Storia della arte cristiana*, vol. vi., Prato, 1880; T. G. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, glossary s. v. "diptychs," Oxford, 1896; H. Graeven, *Frühchristliche und mittelalterliche Elfenbeinwerke*, Rome, 1898 sqq.; G. Rietschl, *Lehrbuch der Liturgik*, i. 231 sqq., Berlin, 1900; *DCA*, i. 560 sqq.; and for the secular use, W. Smith, W. Wayte, and G. E. Marindin, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, i. 643–644, London, 1890.

LIBERATUS: Deacon at Antioch and ecclesiastical writer; fl. about 560. He was the author of a work which is an important source for the history of the ecclesiastical controversies of the fifth and sixth centuries, *Breviarum causæ Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum* (ed. J. Garnier, Paris, 1675; reprinted in *MPL*, lxviii. 963–1052). The book utilizes the history of the preceding century to demonstrate that Justinian's condemnation of the Three Chapters (see Three Chapter Controversy) is false and untenable. The history begins with the ordination of Nestorius, and comes down approximately to 560. The date is shown by the mention of the death of Pope Vigilius (555) and by the fact that at the close of the last chapter Patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria (d. 566) is referred to as yet alive. The work mentions as sources the *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita* of Cassiodorus (q.v.), *Gesta synodalia*, *Epistolæ sanctorum patrum*, a *Gesta de nomine Acacii* of Pope Gelasius I. (q.v.), and finally a *Græcum Alexandriæ scriptum*, which some have identified with the ecclesiastical history of Zacharias Scholasticus (q.v.). The style is concise and not always clear, the tone judicious, and the general treatment trustworthy, notwithstanding its partizan attitude as against the Monophysites.

G. Krüger.

Bibliography: Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, xii. 685–692, Hamburg, 1809; *DCB*, iii. 716–717; *KL*, vii. 1944; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xi. 303–305.

LIBERIA, lai-bî′ri-a: A republic on the west coast of Africa, having a coast line of about 350 miles from Sierra Leone to the French colony of the Ivory Coast, and stretching inland to a distance in some cases of 200 miles. The total area is about 45,000 square miles; the population is estimated at 2,000,000, all of African race, the few whites being considered foreigners. It was founded as a colony in 1822 by free blacks sent out by the American Colonization Society. According to the constitution adopted in 1847, when Liberia was declared an independent government, electors must be of negro blood and owners of land. The Americo-Liberians, numbering about 20,000, hold the chief power, the native races, while not excluded from the franchise, taking little part in political life. At one time it was thought that the Americo-Liberians were dying out, but intermixture with the more civilized aborigines and some immigration from the west has strengthened them. They are all Protestants, connected chiefly with the Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopal, and Lutheran Churches. There is a Roman Catholic Mission, statistics for which are not available. The earliest missionary work, apart from that connected with the Colonization Society, was begun by the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1831, followed by the Presbyterian in 1833, the Protestant Episcopal in 1836, and the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in 1859. The Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions withdrew in 1899, transferring all its property and churches to the presbytery of West Africa. Educational work has been pushed by all these Churches, some of their schools being of high grade. Apart from these, elementary schools are numerous, and there are a few of secondary grade. Considerable attention is paid to industrial training, notably in the Lutheran Muhlenberg Mission. It was in Liberia that the Methodist Bishop Taylor inaugurated his scheme for African industrial missions. The fact that only a comparatively narrow strip of land along the coast is effectively administered, and that the inland territory is occupied by some of the fiercest African tribes, has given much prominence to the missionary enterprises in the country. The work is conducted for the most part by the negroes, on account of the climate and the general type of life, although there is a considerable force of white missionaries on the coast. The four societies report over 5.000 communicant members, nearly one hundred schools with 5,000 pupils, a considerable portion of whom are from the inland tribes. See AFRICA, II. EDWIN MUNSELL BLISS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: See the literature under AFRICA.

First Period, till His Exile.

LIBERIUS, lɑi-bî′ri-ʊs: Pope 352–366. He was of Roman birth and parentage, was the choice of both factions in the Arian controversy and of the Emperor Constantius as successor to Julius I., and was probably consecrated May 17, 352 (cf. *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, p. ccl.). The favor of Constantius was due to his purpose, steadily entertained since he had become the sole ruler (353), to achieve the peace of the Church by disavowal of Athanasius and abolition of the Nicene Creed (see ARIANISM, § 5), a result which obviously hinged on the type of occupant of the Roman see. At a synod at Rome convened by Liberius, the majority of the bishops declared for Athanasius; but, at the synod called by the emperor at Arles (353), the pope's delegates, Vincentius and Marcellus of Campania, as a peace measure, consented to support the decision of the East against Athanasius. Liberius, dissatisfied with the action of his own representatives, addressed a letter of urgent remonstrance to the emperor (*Epist. ad Constantium*), and furthermore managed to engage Eusebius of Vercellæ to support him. Nevertheless, the Synod of Milan (355) completed the victory over Athanasius, and the bishops who had continued steadfast were driven into exile. The same fate awaited the pope unless he yielded. The imperial eunuch Eusebius, who came to confer with him at Rome, attempted to move him by argument to subscribe adversely to Athanasius and to accept ecclesiastical fellowship with his opponents. Liberius resisted, possibly relying upon the sentiments of the Roman populace, which ran counter to the imperial endeavors (Ammianus Marcellinus, XV., vii. 10). Hereupon the pope was apprehended by night by the prefect of the city and removed to the imperial court. In an audience with the emperor, reported by Theodoret (*Hist. eccl.*, ii. 13; *NPNF*, 2 ser., iii. 77–79), he made a spirited appeal for general acceptation of the Nicene Creed, recall of the exiles, and convention of a synod in Alexandria to examine the charges against Athanasius. The one consequence was his own exile to Beræa in Thrace, in 355, when Constantius had the Roman archdeacon Felix consecrated as pope (see FELIX II.).

Acceptance of Homoiousianism.

The new pope encountered great opposition, not because of any doubt as to his personal orthodoxy, but rather because people believed him tainted with irregular ordination and ecclesiastical fellowship with the contrary party. While the emperor was in Rome in May, 357, in answer to an appeal by some ladies for the return of Liberius (Theodoret, II., xiv.), the emperor let it appear that negotiations with the exiled pope had led to the desired result. Liberius did not return to his congregation, however, till the summer of 358. The emperor wished that he and Felix superintend the Church in common; but this was found impossible, and Felix had to yield. Various explanations have been given of the emperor's change of mind. Some speak of a collapse on the part of Liberius, and assert that he reversed his dogmatic position. But this is not borne out by the report of Sozomen (*Hist. eccl.*, iv. 15), who alone reports on the subject. The sole fact apparent is that, after somewhat prolonged negotiations, in the spring of 358 Liberius expressed his willingness to waive the term *homoousios*. He had been convinced that the formula at issue was liable to misunderstanding, and declared himself in harmony with the theory of the Homoiousians, according to which the Son is " like " to the Father (of like essence and attributes). That he rejected the term *homoousios*, or that he consented in any degree to the thought of designating the Son as unlike the Father (*anomoios*), Sozomen pronounces a malicious invention. Yet it is open to question whether the tone of Sozomen adequately accounts for the sharp utterances of Athanasius (*Historia Arianorum*, xli.; *NPNF*, 2 ser., iv. 284) and Jerome (*Chronicon*, and *De vir. ill.*, xcvii.) against Liberius, in which Athanasius states that Liberius grew languid in exile, and subscribed in dread of threatened death, while Jerome reproaches Liberius with heresy. Athanasius and Jerome are supported by four letters ascribed to Liberius, preserved in the so-called *Fragmenta ex opere historico* of Hilary of Poitiers; if these letters are genuine, their contents put the result in a light unfavorable to the pope, showing that Liberius acquiesced in the condemnation of Athanasius and accepted a homoian statement, the second Sirmian formula of 357. But the genuineness of the letters is doubtful, since it is almost universally conceded that the four letters are not to be separated one from the others, in which case the weight of evidence turns against the genuineness of all the letters by the fact that certain particulars in one of the letters (the one which begins: *Studens paci*) totally contradict well-attested history. There is the possibility that during his exile, under the stress of constant pressure, Liberius may have used some utterances which seemed to give occasion to the charge against him. But that he directly belied his earlier position can be asserted only on the ground of doubtful documents.

Later Life; Achievements.

Liberius took no part in the Synod of Ariminum, 359. Several years elapse without note of him in public life. In 363, however, he put forth a brief (*Epist. ad catholicos episcopos Italiæ*) dispensing pardon to all those who repented of their action at Ariminum and renounced Arian doctrine. These terms indeed were not agreeable to a more austere school of ecclesiastics, even at Rome; and the resultant opposition led to cleavages which were anything but salutary (see Hilarius; and Lucifer of Calaris). In 366, as the representative of orthodoxy, the pope accorded fraternal reception to the envoys of the Macedonians (see Macedonius and the Macedonian Sect) of Asia Minor, on the ground of subscription to the Nicene Creed; and returned greetings of peace to those who had authorized their errand (*Epist. ad universos Orientis orthodoxos episcopos*). After the death of Felix (Nov. 22, 365), Liberius readmitted the clerics of his party to their former stations. His death (Sept. 24, 366) nevertheless gave the signal for fierce factional conflicts, accompanied by horrible bloodshed (see Ursinus). According to the *Liber pontificalis,* Liberius was laid to rest in the Cemetery of Priscilla, along the Via Salaria. It is hardly probable that the poem of eulogy discovered by De Rossi, on the subject of an unnamed bishop, refers to Liberius (De Rossi, in *Bulletino di Archeologia Cristiana,* 4th ser., vol. ii., 1883, pp. 5–59); but rather to Martin I. (cf. Funk, *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen,* i. 391–420, Paderborn, 1887). Liberius created a lasting memorial for himself at Rome by founding the Basilica Liberiana (Santa Maria Maggiore), which, even to-day, is important historically in the office for Christ's nativity and the season of Advent (cf. H. Usener, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen,* i. 266–293, Bonn, 1889.) It was probably here in the year 354 that the birth of Christ was celebrated for the first time on Dec. 25. So late as the preceding year Liberius had consecrated Marcellina, sister of Ambrose, as a nun on Jan. 6, still observed as the day of the nativity. The pope's address delivered on this occasion was preserved by Ambrose in a free transcript (*De virgine,* iii. 1 sqq.). In the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* Liberius is celebrated on September 23; but his name does not appear in the *Martyrologium Romanum.* Ever since the sixth century his reputation has suffered distortion through apocryphal tradition, exhibiting him in league with Constantius as a bloody persecutor of the true faith; while Felix is portrayed as a holy martyr (cf. J. J. I. von Döllinger: *Die Papstfabeln des Mittelalters,* ed. Friedrich, pp. 126–145, Munich, 1890; Eng. transl., of first ed., *Fables Respecting the Popes of the Middle Ages,* New York, 1872). G. Krüger.

Bibliography: *Liber pontificalis,* ed. Duchesne, i. pp. cxx.-cxxvii., ccl. 207–210, Paris, 1886, ed. Mommsen in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.,* i (1898), 77–79; Jaffé. *Regesta,* i. 32–35; B. Jungmann, *Dissertationes selectæ,* ii. 31–33, Regensburg, 1881; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche,* i. 460–494, Bonn, 1881; G. Krüger, *Lucifer von Calaris,* pp. 12 sqq., Leipsic, 1886; H. M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism,* pp. 192 sqq., Cambridge, 1900; C. de Feis, *Storia di Liberio papa e dello scisma dei Seminariani,* Rome, 1894; F. Gregorovius, *Hist. of the City of Rome,* i. 108–109, London, 1894; T. Mommsen, in *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft,* i (1897), 167–179; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte,* i. 647 sqq., 681 sqq., Eng. transl., i. 199 sqq.; Bower, *Popes,* i. 59–82; Milman, *Latin Christianity,* i. 102–108. Very recently the genuineness of the four letters of Liberius has been maintained by L. Duchesne, in *Mélanges d'histoire et d'archéologie,* xxviii (1908), 31–78, and opposed by A. Wilmart, in *Revue Bénédictine,* xxiv (1907), 293–317, and by F. Savio, *Nuovi Studi sulla questione di Papa Liberio,* Rome, 1909.

LIBERMANN, JACOB. See Holy Ghost, Orders and Congregations of the, II., 6.

LIBERTINES: A word used in various senses.

1. The members of a Jewish synagogue at Jerusalem mentioned in Acts vi. 9. They probably possessed a synagogue of their own, though some have held that they worshiped with the Cyrenians, Alexandrians, Cilicians, and Asiatics, or at least with the two first named. The meaning of the name is not entirely certain. As there is no certain record of an (African) city or district from which they could take their name, it seems probable that the word denotes "freedmen" (Lat. *libertini*), meaning the descendants of Jews taken captive to Rome by Pompey, and there later released because their stubborn adherence to their national customs rendered them useless as slaves. While the majority of these freedmen remained in Rome and settled in the *regio Transtiberina* (Suetonius, *Tiberius,* xxxvi.; Tacitus, *Annales,* ii. 85), others seemed to have returned to Jerusalem and to have formed a synagogue where the name of Libertines, or Roman freedmen, lingered.

(F. Sieffert.)

2. A political party led by Ami Perrin, hence known also as Perrinists, which opposed Calvin in his efforts to reform the morals of Geneva. Before the Reformation they had striven for the liberty of the city against the Roman Catholic bishop and the duke of Savoy, and under the rule of Calvin they especially opposed the excommunication by the consistory of those deemed by it unworthy to partake of the Lord's Supper. They also contended against the admission of French refugees as burghers of the city, and in May, 1555, endeavored in vain to lead a violent protest against the influence of these refugees and the French preachers. Some of the leaders fled, others were sentenced to death, and thus the party was completely disrupted. Their significance is in their attitude as liberals opposed to the strict Calvinistic Puritans.

E. Choisy.

3. A pantheistic antinomian party which flourished about the time of the Reformation. It appeared first in the Netherlands and from there spread into France. Its roots may perhaps reach into the soil of the Brethren of the Free Spirit (see Free Spirit, Brethren of the), a sect which had not entirely died out, and there may have been connections also with the Anabaptists [i.e., with such pantheistic antipedobaptists as David Joris, q.v.—A. H. N.]. The adherents gave themselves the name "Spirituals"; "Libertines" being the title given by the opponents of the party. The founder appears to have been named Coppin, who preached at Lille about 1529, whence his teaching was carried into the French-speaking part of the country, and thence into France by a certain Quintin, by Antoine Pocquet, once a Roman Catholic priest, and by others. Their teaching was to the effect that all visible existence is but a manifestation of the one Spirit; hence nothing can be essentially bad; the regenerate man is he who recognizes that the distinction between good and bad is baseless, and consequently has attained the innocence which Adam had before he knew good and evil. In France those who held these views found protection under Margaret, Queen of Navarre, at Nérac; but they met a stern opponent in Calvin, whose influence with Margaret and other measures probably brought about the extinction of the party. In 1547 Calvin warned the Christians of Rouen against a Franciscan monk who expounded the dogma of predestination after the method of the Libertines. The latter replied in *Bouclier de défence*, which Farel answered in *Glaive de la parole véritable* (Geneva, 1550). Calvin speaks of two anonymous French writings which he ascribes neither to Quintin nor to Pocquet, which seem to be of a mystical Libertine cast. Some writings of this character were collected by C. Schmidt, *Traités mystiques écrits . . . 1547–49* (Geneva, 1876), and by E. Picot, *Théâtre mystique de Pierre Du Val et des Libertins spirituels de Rouen au 16. siècle* (ib. 1882; cf. G. Jaujard, *Essai sur les Libertins spirituels de Genève* [?], Paris, 1890). See also LOISTS.

E. CHOISY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On 1: Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. 65, 431, iii. 84, Eng. transl., II., i. 49, ii. 56–57, 276; *EB*, iii. 2793–2794; *DB*, iii. 110; and the commentaries on the passage. On 2: A. Roget, *Hist. du peuple de Genève*, vols. ii.–iv., 7 vols., Geneva, 1871–84; E. Choisy, *La Théocratie à Genève au temps de Calvin*, Geneva, 1897. On 3: *CR*, vii. 145, 341; Calvin, *Institutes*, III., iii. 14; F. Trechsel, *Die protestantischen Antitrinitarier*, i. 177, Heidelberg, 1839; Hundeshagen, in *TSK*, xviii (1845), 866 sqq.; A. Jundt, *Hist. du panthéisme populaire*, Strasburg, 1875. For further information on 2–3 consult also the works on the life of Calvin given under CALVIN, JOHN, e.g., W. Walker, pp. 293–295, New York, 1906.

LIBERTY, RELIGIOUS.

I. General Development.
  Historical Survey (§ 1).
  The Evangelical Spirit, Especially in England (§ 2).
  In America (§ 3).
  Humanistic Influences (§ 4).
II. In Germany.
  The Theory of Non-Toleration (§ 1).
  The Situation at and During the Reformation (§ 2).
  Toleration of Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Reformed (§ 3).
  Change in the Political Theory of the Church (§ 4).
  Present Legal Status of Churches (§ 5).
  Roman Catholic Attitude (§ 6).

I. General Development: Religious liberty is, in the fullest sense of the term, unrestricted freedom to believe, practise, and propagate any religion whatever or none.

1. Historical Survey.

The Edict of Milan (see CONSTANTINE THE GREAT AND HIS SONS, I., § 4) issued by Constantine and Licinius in 313 seems to be the only ancient proclamation by a civil government of absolute religious liberty. The edict grants "both to the Christians and to all men freedom to follow the religion which they choose," "each one should have the liberty of worshiping whatever deity he pleases." "This has been done by us in order that we might not seem in any way to discriminate against any rank or religion." This action was taken in the interest of Christianity and the edict contains instructions for the restitution of all church property taken from Christians in the Diocletian persecution. Constantine's later policy in relation to non-Catholic Christian parties and paganism was inconsistent with the declarations of the edict. From this time onward nothing more liberal than toleration appears in civil legislation until modern times. Pleas for religious liberty were frequently made by persecuted minorities; but neither civil governments nor dominant ecclesiastical parties paid heed to them. Luther pleaded for liberty in the most thoroughgoing way (1519–20); yet when confronted with religious radicalism (1521 onward) he became convinced that only drastic measures of repression could save the situation and urged the rulers to spare not. Humanists and Socinians argued for a broad toleration, and some of them no doubt would have rejoiced to see absolute liberty of conscience incorporated in the civil constitutions and in the confessions of faith; but they were not optimistic enough even to hope for such a consummation. Balthasar Huebmaier (q.v.), when his life was being sought by the Austrian government and he was in imminent danger, wrote in 1524 a tract "Concerning Heretics and their Burners" (cf. H. C. Vedder, *Balthasar Hübmaier*, pp. 84–88, New York, 1905) in which he sought to show the heresy, antichristian character, and futility of persecution for conscience's sake. Calvin was from the beginning an avowed antitolerationist. Regarding the Old-Testament theocracy as in an important sense a model for the Christian state, he thought it the duty of the church authorities to detect, convict, and denounce heretics and open sinners of every type, and of Christian magistrates to execute Church censures even to the extent of inflicting capital punishment in extreme cases. For the Christian minister or magistrate to allow a heretic to disseminate his errors was as little allowable as it would be to permit a miscreant to go about spreading the pestilence. Calvin had the full sympathy of Melanchthon, Butzer, Bullinger, Knox, and other leading reformers in his antagonism to religious liberty. In this he was followed for more than a century by English and American Puritans, Scottish Presbyterians, and by Reformed and Lutheran Churches in general. The progress of religious liberty has been greatly impeded also by the general conviction that the divergent religious opinions of minorities are malignant and inspired by the devil and that no treatment is too severe for the disseminators of diabolical error; that two forms of religion can not exist in the same state without disastrous consequences; that civil rulers have a right to determine the religion of their subjects (see TERRITORIALISM); that the established order is of divine right and that innovation is *ipso facto* evil. The Peace of Augsburg (1555; see AUGSBURG, RELIGIOUS PEACE OF) and the Peace of Westphalia (1648; see WESTPHALIA, PEACE OF) each in turn confirmed the states of Europe in territorialism.

The two lines of influence already mentioned wrought mightily for the breaking down of the intolerance of conservatism, for a long time separately and at last cooperatively, namely the old

2. The Evangelical Spirit, Especially in England.

Evangelical and the Humanistic. The old Evangelical spirit (represented by the Waldenses [q.v.], Peter of Chelcic, and the Bohemian Brethren [q.v.], in the Middle Ages, and by the Anabaptists and the Society of Friends in more recent times) made a sharp distinction between the Old Testament and the New Testament, making the latter alone an authoritative guide in doctrine and polity and laying chief stress on the very words and acts of Christ. Most of them assumed an attitude of passive resistance toward civil governments, denying the possibility of a Christian state (if all were Christians there would be no need of civil government), and rejecting magistracy, oaths, warfare, and capital punishment as inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity and with the precepts and example of Christ and the apostles. To use coercion in connection with religion seemed to them monstrous. Interpreting the Sermon on the Mount literally they thought it wrong to resist evil or to defend themselves. Only when fired by chiliastic enthusiasm and convinced that it was the divine will that they should smite the ungodly and become instruments for the establishment of the kingdom of Christ on earth (see Taborites; Muenzer, Thomas; Fifth Monarchy Men) did they trust in the arm of flesh. This quietistic form of Christianity, while it produced the noblest examples of self-sacrificing devotion and of evangelistic zeal, was too much out of accord with the life and thought of the times to exert a strong influence in favor of religious liberty; though the Mennonites in the Netherlands became numerous and wealthy enough to gain the cooperation of the government in efforts to secure toleration for the persecuted in other lands. It was only when the old Evangelical type of New-Testament Christianity became blended with Calvinistic Puritanism that it was able powerfully to influence the Christian world in favor of liberty of conscience. Robert Browne (q.v.) reached the conviction, probably under Mennonite influence (1580–84), that civil magistrates ought not to punish religious delinquencies or in any way to interfere with the rights of conscience. His immediate Separatist followers failed to grasp the principle and he himself soon abandoned it. About 1609 a party of English Separatists led by John Smyth, exiled in Holland, reached antipedobaptist convictions and at the same time adopted the old Evangelical principle of separation of Church and State and liberty of conscience in the most absolute sense (see Baptists, I., §§ 1–4). A portion of the company under the leadership of Helwys and Murton returned to England (1611 or 1612) and members of this Arminian antipedobaptist party addressed to the government and published a series of pleas for absolute liberty of conscience (1614, 1615, 1620) that influenced wide circles of readers (see Baptists, § 9; cf. *Tracts on Liberty of Conscience*, Hanserd Knollys Society, London, 1846). The triumph of the Independents (Baptist and Congregational) first over established episcopacy and then over Presbyterianism, which sought to become the established Church and purposed the suppression of all forms of dissent, led to a measure of religious equality under Cromwell (1649, sqq.) for such Congregationalists, Baptists, and Presbyterians as were friendly to the government and of suitable education and character, all alike being admitted to endowed pastorates when invited by the parishioners; but there was no thought of tolerating Roman Catholics, High-church Episcopalians, or Unitarians. Toleration of Evangelical dissent has prevailed in England from 1689 and dissenters' disabilities have been gradually diminished; but even now the free Churches of England are struggling valiantly for religious equality which means the disestablishment and the disendowment of the established Church.

3. In America.

In America the early British colonies were formed on an antitolerationist basis, the Calvinistic theocratic idea prevailing in Massachusetts and Connecticut and the Anglican establishment taking control in Virginia and other Southern colonies and in New York after it was taken from the Dutch (see United States of America, Religious History of). Roger Williams (q.v.; also Baptists, II., §§ 1–2), having been banished from Massachusetts, established a small colony at Providence on the basis of liberty of conscience (1636) and, in cooperation with John Clarke (q.v.; also Baptists, II., § 3), the larger colony subsequently known as Rhode Island (1647). The publication of the pleas for liberty of conscience by Williams and Clarke, and their association in England with the leading statesmen of the Cromwellian time no doubt greatly influenced opinion there. In Maryland Lord Baltimore, the proprietor, tolerated and encouraged a body of Puritans who had been driven from Virginia on account of their non-conformity (1643). In Virginia the Baptists, supported to some extent by Presbyterians and freethinkers (Jefferson, Madison, and others), waged an uncompromising warfare against the established Church (1776–99) and succeeded in securing its disestablishment and disendowment, and absolute religious equality (see Baptists, II., § 6). They were also influential in securing the insertion of the clause in the Constitution of the United States that guarantees religious liberty. The triumph of religious liberty in Virginia and the provision for it in the national Constitution led to the removal of all restrictions to the free exercise of religion in Connecticut (1820) and in Massachusetts (1833). The successful experiment of religious liberty on so large a scale soon made its influence felt throughout the Christian world. American influence was a factor in the French Revolution. After the abolition of Christianity by the Terrorists, Napoleon put Roman Catholicism, Lutheranism, Calvinism, and other recognized forms of religion upon the same basis of state support and state control in France, the Netherlands, and other parts of his empire. Complete religious liberty has recently come about in France through the separation of Church and State (see France).

Side by side with the influence of the old Evangelical New-Testament Christianity, the advance of liberal thought under the influence of Humanism has wrought for freedom of thought and liberty of conscience. Skeptical minds not only demand toleration for themselves; but are not so absolutely sure that their own views of religion are exclusively valid as to consider it necessary to force them upon others.

4. Humanistic Influences.

The growth of scientific study and the application of the historical method to the study of religion have tended to break down dogmatism and intolerance. The French freethinking of the eighteenth century not only prepared the way for the French Revolution, but covered Europe and America with its influence. French freethinking cooperated with Baptist insistence on separation of Church and State and equality of rights for all religious parties in the American struggle. See CONVENTICLE ACT; CORPORATION ACT; FIVE MILE ACT; TEST ACT; TOLERATION ACT OF 1689; UNIFORMITY, ACTS OF. A. H. NEWMAN.

II. In Germany: There is now no German State which does not grant freedom of conscience, both to individuals and to communities which are united by common religious interests. In itself toleration may be observed toward non-Christian as well as toward Christian bodies, as in Germany toward the Jews; yet in Germany the legislation concerning the Jews has not arisen from motives of toleration but of alien laws, and as it still retains this character it falls outside the limits of the present discussion.

A Church, as such, while loving and patient in pastoral care, can not be tolerant either in dogmatics or ethics. For since an individual Church exists simply because it recognizes a certain concept of Christian revelation as the only correct one, it can not permit divergent concepts within its fold.

1. The Theory of Non-Toleration.

This was the actual attitude assumed before the Reformation, especially as the Church then not only controlled both her own members, so that she could exclude irreclaimable heretics from her communion, but also had such power over the State that the latter would punish such heretics, if necessary, with death. The constitution *Ad decus* of Frederick II. (1220), requiring the death penalty, repeats almost literally the third chapter of the fourth Lateran Council (1215), and is rendered still more strict by the same emperor's constitutions *Catharos* (1232) and *Patarenos* (1238). The enforcement of the death penalty by burning, prescribed also by the *Sachsenspiegel* (*Landrecht*, II., xiv. 17) and the Bamberg criminal code of 1507 (art. 30), is illustrated by the proceedings against Huss at Constance and by the action of the German princes against the Hussites. This use of power of the pre-Reformation Church is fully explicable from her point of view. If, as she believed, she was the one visible Church founded by Christ, if every one baptized belonged to her, if she was responsible for their salvation, and if this salvation depended on the obedience of each individual to her authority, there was no reason for her to hesitate to use her influence with the State to gain her such obedience. The Church had developed into a dogmatic system her claim to control the executive means of the State in given cases to her advantage; and as long as this principle was acknowledged by the authorities of the State, its powers were in a sense her own, to be employed when conscience dictated.

When Luther, at the Leipsic disputation, rejected the doctrine that the interpretation of the Bible was to be conditioned by the authority of the Church, the latter appealed to the laws against heretics.

2. The Situation at and During the Reformation.

But these were ignored by those princes who held that the Church must be reformed and who were in sympathy with Luther's views. On the other hand, the ban against Luther and the bull *Decet Romanum pontificem* (Jan. 3, 1521) led to the Edict of Worms (Jan. 26, 1521; antedated Jan. 8), which followed the laws against heretics, declared Luther an outlaw, and required the local authorities to imprison him and his adherents. Other princes, however, refused to execute the edict, declaring that they could not reconcile it with their duty to their subjects and their land; and in view of the wide-felt need of a religious reformation, and in consideration of the unsettled religious conditions, the Diet of Speyer (Aug. 27, 1526) declared that, until a council should have been held, no prince should be obliged to obey the edict. This enactment at Speyer was the first German law of toleration, although primarily it was merely a provisional suspension of a law which was by no means abrogated. The next step in advance was the religious peace of Augsburg in 1555 (see AUGSBURG, RELIGIOUS PEACE OF). The most promising, though unsuccessful, attempt to force the German princes to obey the Edict of Worms was made in the Schmalkald War, and the proviso of 1526 now became definite. Although the old laws against heretics were still in force, it was no longer possible, by the laws of the empire, to secure their obedience from such princes as would not maintain them in their dominions. A second fruitless attempt to have the laws against heretics enforced was made by the Roman Catholics in the Thirty Years' War (q.v.), but with the Peace of Westphalia (Oct. 24, 1648; see WESTPHALIA, PEACE OF; and below) the religious peace of Augsburg was confirmed by imperial law. Nevertheless, this merely gave the German princes a right which they had not legally possessed before, permitting them, in so far as they were unfettered by agreements with their estates, to enforce or ignore the old laws against heretics. The empire was accordingly divided, in the eyes of the Curia, into States "in which the Holy Office is exercised," and those "in which heretics rage unpunished." But it must be borne in mind that anything like the modern concept of toleration was equally unknown to the Protestants as well. The theory of the Reformers was that the State had received authority not only to maintain the law in general, but the law of God, especially as set forth in the Decalogue, in particular. In virtue of the First Table, therefore, the State was divinely required to permit only the right worship of God. The pre-Reformation relation of Church and State thus received a theological foundation. Toleration of any worship which was "not right" was accordingly excluded, and its prevention was a duty for which the State was responsible to God—the only change was the abolition of the criminal proceedings against heretics, and the substitution of police regulation. Since, however, neither Roman Catholic nor Protestant would admit that his opponent also taught true doctrine, it became practically necessary merely to recognize the power of the authority of each country as purely personal, a concept later expressed in the phrase "whose is the land, his is the religion." Nevertheless, the Protestants gained the one point that those who adhered to the Augsburg Confession could only be banished by Roman Catholic princes, and not brought before a criminal court.

3. Toleration of Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Reformed.

A further step was made in the Peace of Westphalia, which, taught by the bitter lesson of the Thirty Years' War, proceeded to real tolerance, and first officially employed the term. It enacted that Roman Catholics in Protestant lands, and Lutherans and Reformed in Roman Catholic lands, should be "tolerated patiently" (*patienter tolerentur*) if they rendered due obedience to the civil authorities and caused no disturbance. They were likewise granted the right of simple private worship. No other religions than those just mentioned, however, were to be "received or tolerated" in the Holy Roman Empire. Thus arose the distinction long maintained between "received" and "tolerated" religion. The Roman Catholic Church declared these enactments of toleration in the Peace of Westphalia null and void by the bull *Zelo domus Dei* (Nov. 20, 1648), and in consequence of the strict Lutheran insistence on the "guardianship of the First Table" likewise had cause to refuse obedience, especially as the Protestants came to hold that Roman Catholicism could be tolerated only when civil authority was insufficient to repress it, or when the State was in such condition that the repression could not be effected without civil war and effusion of blood, or when its repression would lead to greater harm than its toleration. This rigid adherence to the "guardianship of the First Table," however, could be carried out only in the narrow domains of the old empire; in lands of more diverse interests a larger spirit was needful. This was first shown in Holland, whence the new movement spread to Germany, especially the rising State of Prussia. When the Lutheran princes of the Palatine Electorate (1560), Bremen (1568), Nassau (1577), Wittgenstein, Solms, and Wied (1577–86), Tecklenburg and Steinfurt (1588), Anhalt (1596), Hesse-Cassel (1604), and Lippe (1605) entered the Reformed Church, they obliged their subjects to follow them; but when, in 1614, the Elector John Sigismund of Brandenburg did likewise, he merely permitted the coexistence of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches in his territories. This precedent of two "received" Churches side by side was taken by the seventh article of the Osnabrück treaty of 1648 as the model of general regulations on the mutual relations of Lutheran and Reformed Churches in one and the same territory. This marks a change from a principle of intolerance to one of tolerance, and of the substitution of a purely political concept of the State for a theological theory.

4. Change in the Political Theory of the Church.

Since the weakness of the empire and the variety of conditions in the individual States were fatal to any national basis for the State in Germany, the social theory, largely represented at the time by Dutch views, and aided since the Renaissance by the trend of juristic and political tenets, formed the necessary substitute. The State being regarded as a congeries of interests united by social contracts, and its authority being derived from a contract to obedience, two theories of the Church became possible. Either it might be assumed, with Hugo Grotius, that the maintenance of the Church as an institution was a function of the State, and that the administration of the Church was essentially administration of the State, this being Territorialism (q.v.). Or it could be supposed that the conditions of religious freedom which had preceded the rise of the State had not been abrogated by the contract of the State. By the latter hypothesis, termed Collegialism (q.v.), first developed by Samuel Pufendorf (q.v.), religion remained a matter of individual freedom, even under the State, and entitled to the protection of the State. Territorialism had been in use for ages, with the substitution of political for theological premises. Collegialism was the way in which the State began the restoration of the social independence inherent in both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Church. Viewing both Churches as unions of religious interests, the State could without prejudice determine under what conditions, based on its general interests, it could and would permit a plurality of such unions of religious interests to coexist. Thus the State reached the standpoint of modern tolerance, as it now prevails in Germany. Yet this point of view was reached only gradually. The Elector John Sigismund of Brandenburg, mentioned above, permitted the Arminians to hold private worship in 1683, and three years later allowed the Reformed refugees from France to have public religious services. But what was allowed by the empire to Prussia was forbidden in the smaller States. Thus when Count Ernest Casimir of Runkel and Isenburg promised religious freedom to all who should settle at Büdingen (Mar. 29, 1712), even though they might not be either Roman Catholics, Lutherans, or Reformed, he was fined and obliged to retract his offer. Prussia, however, continued in her course, and Frederick the Great granted religious freedom to Mennonites, Socinians, Arians, Schwenckfelders, and other sects. On the other hand, he never issued any law of toleration, nor did even the Roman Catholic Church gain full equality with the two Protestant bodies during his reign. The example of Frederick, who was more influenced by Voltaire and the Encyclopedists than by Pufendorf and Thomasius, was followed in the edict of toleration promulgated by Joseph II. of Austria (Oct. 18, 1781) and by the Elector Clement Wenzel of Treves in 1783. Finally, by the religious edict of 1788 and the general Prussian statute of 1794 the Roman Catholic Church received equal privileges with the Lutherans and the Reformed.

In France Protestantism was again recognized by Louis XVI. in Nov., 1787, and two years later the French Revolution declared for entire liberty of worship, a position retained under Napoleon. As a result of the extension of this legislation to the German territories west of the Rhine which had come into the possession of France in exchange for districts east of the same river, religious toleration was granted to the Protestants in the archdiocese of Cologne and the dioceses of Münster and Paderborn. A like course was followed by Bavaria (Aug. 21, 1801), and by Cleve-Berg, the grand duchy of Frankfort, and the kingdom of Westphalia. But while the German Act of Confederation (Jan. 8, 1815) granted toleration to Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Reformed, it referred everything regarding the development, administration, and organic life of the Churches to special legislation. Accordingly, in the legislation of both Bavaria (May 26, 1818) and Baden (Aug. 22, 1818) the right of private worship was extended to others than members of the three great ecclesiastical bodies. The only further step now possible was the extension of this privilege to public worship; and this was granted by laws of Baden (Feb. 17, 1849) and Prussia (Jan. 31, 1850), these and similar laws following the Frankfort statutes of 1848. The last vestige of religious discrimination was removed by the law of the German Confederation of July 3, 1869, which granted complete civil equality to the various confessions.

5. Present Legal Status of Churches.

Since the beginning of the nineteenth century the German theory of the legal status of the Church passed through the entire revolution possible from the stage after bare existence. Beginning with the exclusion of adherents of unfavored religious bodies from full civil rights, it advanced to the permission of private worship, either without clergy ("simple") or with them ("qualified"). The next step was the right to hold public worship, which was "private" when the religious community in question was not essentially privileged, and "public" when it was so privileged by the State. This later came to be construed as the granting of corporation-rights to a Church, which, in such States as Oldenburg, Waldeck, and Prussia, can be done only by the passage of a law, as was done in Prussia in 1874 and 1875, for example, for the Baptists and Mennonites. Religious communities can secure the rights of a corporation, unless objected to by the State, by being entered in the register kept by the local authorities; though where a special law is necessary for the acquisition of such rights, the need of such laws is not thereby abrogated. The Imperial Criminal Code (§ 166) grants any religious body with corporation-rights within the empire special protection against public insults to its institutions and usages; and special privileges are also accorded the clergy of such bodies. Since the Peace of Westphalia, therefore, toleration has been extended from the Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Reformed to all religions, so that the minimum accorded to any religious body is now "private" public worship.

6. Roman Catholic Attitude.

The Roman Catholic Church maintains her pre-Reformation attitude toward toleration by the State, as protested against both by the papal nuncio Chigi (Oct. 26, 1648) and the bull *Zelo domus Dei* (Nov. 20, 1648), on the ground that the State has no authority to issue such regulations. Similar protests have repeatedly been made by the Curia, as by the briefs of Pius VII. against the toleration of Protestants in Bavaria (Feb. 13 and Nov. 19, 1803), the encyclicals *Mirari vos* of Gregory XVI. (Aug. 15, 1832), Pius IX. (Dec. 8, 1864), and Leo XIII. (Nov. 1, 1885). Nevertheless, this church does not condemn those who, for the promotion of great good or the avoidance of grave scandal, tolerate the existence of various cults in the State. At the same time she insists that no one may be forced to accept the faith against his will, although this is construed as applying to non-Christians, and not to baptized Protestants, the latter being regarded as heretics, and hence subject to compulsory conversion by the secular arm. Leo XIII., while maintaining this position, declared that a State tolerating heretics should not be incontinently condemned, but should be temporized with as circumstances should demand. The official Roman Catholic rejection of the principle of toleration accordingly remains unchanged in essence, and it is, therefore, her endeavor and hope that the State may some time be convinced of the justness of her attitude, and again adopt the policy of non-toleration.

(E. Friedberg.)

Bibliography: A large number of documents dealing with the progress of the idea in England are contained in Gee and Hardy, *Documents*. Consult: J. Locke, *Three Letters on Toleration*, reprint, London, 1876 (on the act of 1689); J. Milton, *Essay on Toleration*, in his *Works*, 8 vols., London, 1867, etc.; J. L. Balmes, *European Civilization; Protestantism and Catholicism*, chaps. xxxiv.–xxxvii., London, 1855 (Roman Catholic); A. Hess, *Ueber religiöse und sittliche Toleranz*, St. Gall, 1884; P. Brooks, *Tolerance*, New York, 1887; E. Lefèvre, *La Liberté religieuse*, Verviers, 1888; P. Schaff, *Progress of Religious Freedom as Shown in the Hist. of Toleration Acts*, New York, 1889; F. Hement, *Entretiens sur la liberté de conscience*, Paris, 1890; L. Marillier, *La Liberté de conscience*, ib. 1890; F. Pollock, *Religious Equality*, in *Oxford Lectures*, London, 1890; G. Canet, *La Liberté de conscience, sa nature, son histoire*, Lyon, 1891; H. Fürstenau, *Das Grundrecht der Religionsfreiheit*, Leipsic, 1891; J. J. I. von Döllinger, in his *Essays on Historical and Literary Subjects*, London, 1894; M. Creighton, *Persecution and Tolerance*, ib. 1895; A. D. White, *Hist. of the Warfare of Science and Theology*, 2 vols., New York, 1896; F. M. Holland, *Liberty in the 19th Century*, ib. 1899; G. Bonet-Maury, *Hist. de la liberté de conscience en France depuis l'édit di Nantes jusqu'au 1870*, Paris, 1900; H. Hello, *Les Libertés modernes d'après les encycliques*, ib. 1900; F. Ruffini, *La libertà religiosa*, Turin, 1900; R. Oertel, *Entwickelung des Grundsatzes Gläubigerbefriedigung*, Leipsic, 1901; S. H. Cobb, *Rise of Religious Liberty in America*, New York, 1902; H. M. King, *Religious Liberty*, Providence, 1903; E. S. P. Haynes, *Religious Persecution*, London, 1904; A. Matagrín, *Hist. de la tolérance religieuse*, Paris, 1905; J. Mackinnon, *A Hist. of Modern Liberty*, vols. i.–iii., New York, 1906 sqq. (to be in 8 vols.); E. Rousse, *La Liberté religieuse en France 1880–1894*, Paris, 1904; *Cambridge Modern History*, v. 324 sqq., New York, 1908; and the literature under the articles referred to in the text.

LICHTENBERGER, liʜ'ten-bārg''er, **FRÉDERIC AUGUSTE**: French Protestant theologian; b. at Strasburg Mar. 21, 1832; d. at Paris Jan. 7, 1899.

He was the descendant of an old Alsatian family; attended the Protestant gymnasium of Strasburg; studied theology there and at several German universities; spent considerable time at Paris; returned to Strasburg where he became bachelor of theology (1854), licentiate (1857), and doctor (1860). In 1864 he was appointed professor of systematic and practical theology in the theological faculty of Strasburg, but his activity was interrupted by the war of 1870. His sympathies were on the side of the French, and he nursed the sick during the siege of his native town. After the war, the German administration offered him as well as his colleagues a place in the newly organized university, but while most of his colleagues accepted the offer, he together with Colani and Sabatier declined. Lichtenberger went to Paris where he was at first employed by the Lutheran consistory as assistant preacher of the Church of Redemption, then he worked six years with great devotion in the service of the Église libre in the Chapelle Taitbout. Chiefly owing to the efforts of Lichtenberger and Auguste Sabatier, Gambetta finally (1877) fulfilled the promise to renew the Strasburg theological faculty in Paris, and for seventeen years Lichtenberger was the efficient dean. During the time between 1871 and 1877 Lichtenberger found ample time to devote himself to his literary works. His was not an original mind, but he could clearly and forcibly reproduce the thoughts of others. His principal works are: *Histoire des idées religieuses en Allemagne depuis le milieu du dix-huitième siècle jusqu'à nos jours* (3 vols., Paris, 1873; Eng. transl., *History of German Theology in the 19th Century*, Edinburgh, 1890), and the French Protestant counterpart to Herzog, *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses* (Paris, 1877–82, 13 vols.). It was also owing to his efforts as Conseil général des facultés and as member of the Conseil supérieur de l'instruction publique that the bond between the Protestant faculty and the other faculties of the university became so close that all attempts to sever it failed. Lichtenberger's personal views on theology and the Church were influenced by Alexander Vinet. As a thorough individualist he inclined toward the ideas of a free Church combating conventionalism in church and theology. In 1895 a chronic disease permanently laid him aside. His valedictory sermon *L'Alsace en deuil* (1871, 10th ed., 1873) preached at Strasburg after the war of 1870, achieved an unprecedented popularity.

(Eugen Lachenmann.)

Bibliography: The funeral address by Sabatier is in *Revue chrétienne*, 1899, pp. 122–127. Consult Lichtenberger, *ESR*, xiii. 120–121.

LIDDON, HENRY PARRY: Church of England; b. at North Stoneham (7 m. s.w. of Winchester) Aug. 20, 1829; d. at Weston-super-Mare (20 m. s.w. of Bristol) Sept. 9, 1890. He was educated in the school at Lyme Regis, continuing at King's College, London, and Christ Church, Oxford. He graduated B.A. in 1850, and the next year won the Johnson theological scholarship, and was made a student of Christ Church. In 1852 he was ordained deacon, in 1853 priest. For the first two months of 1852 he was curate at Wantage (21 m. n.n.w. of Reading), then for a little while did duty at Finedon (12 m. n.e. of Northampton). In 1854 he became first vice-principal of the theological college at Cuddesdon (6 m. s.s.e. of Oxford), which had just been established by Samuel Wilberforce, bishop of Oxford, but his High-church views excited so much opposition and exposed his bishop to so much criticism that he was compelled to resign on Dec. 29, 1858, and he left the following Easter. Almost immediately he became vice-principal of St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford. There his position was more congenial by far, and he quickly became a power in the university by the Sunday-evening lectures on the New Testament, which he carried on with great success until 1869 and again from 1883 till the close of his life. But in 1862 illness forced his resignation of the vice-principalship. In 1864 he became examining chaplain to Walter Kerr Hamilton, bishop of Salisbury, with whose Anglo-Catholic views he was in full accord. In 1865 he was chosen Bampton lecturer, and produced the volume by which he is best known, *The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ* (London, 1866, 14th ed. 1890). In 1870 he became Ireland professor of exegesis of Holy Scripture at Oxford, and so remained till 1882, when he resigned because, as he said, he could not do justice to the office and at the same time meet his other engagements. In 1870 he became a canon of St. Paul's, London. He was now a preacher of established repute, and held the attention of vast crowds, although his sermons were inordinately long. He was always tremendously in earnest, full of spiritual fervor, simple in his language, and clear in his argumentation. He read his sermons closely because the strain of addressing such large audiences was felt by him and he did not wish to be under the additional strain which extempore speech would have entailed.

He maintained some extreme positions. Thus he defended John Purchas, who had been condemned for ritualism, and likewise the Reverend Thomas Pelham Dale and the Reverend Richard William Enraght, the ritualists who had refused to obey the judgment of the court of arches, going so far as to question its authority. His conservatism came out in his defense of the continued use of the Athanasian Creed; in his assertion that the higher criticism of the Old Testament impugned the infallibility of Jesus Christ and was, therefore, to be rejected; and in his contention against the archbishop of Canterbury, that the presence even of a bishop of the Church of England in Jerusalem was an intrusion on the diocese of the patriarch of Jerusalem.

Christ College, Oxford, was his home when not in residence in St. Paul's, and to that university he gave much of himself. In 1866–70 he was active in the founding of Keble College, and in 1883–84 of Pusey House, both at Oxford, and both established by the friends of the High-church party.

His preaching was practically limited to the universities of Oxford and Cambridge and as canon of St. Paul's, London, and his publications were almost exclusively sermons and a large part of the life of Pusey. He was asked on several occasions to accept an episcopal appointment, but he would not consider it. In

1886 he did accept the chancellorship of St. Paul's cathedral. He was, as might be expected, deeply interested in the Old Catholic movement, and attended the Bonn conference of 1875, took a leading part in it, and translated the record of its proceedings.

Bibliography: The principal biography is by J. O. Johnston, *Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon*, London, 1904. Others are by A. B. Donaldson, ib. 1905; G. W. E. Russell, ib. 1909, and in *DNB*, xxxiii. 223–228.

LIDWINA (LIDWIGIS, LIDIA), SAINT: Dutch virgin; b. at Schiedam (4 m. w. of Rotterdam) Mar. 18, 1380; d. there April 14, 1433. Born of prosperous parents she was of so great beauty that she was besieged with suitors from her thirteenth year. She had no desire for marriage, however, and prayed to God that he would make her so loathsome that no man could look upon her with pleasure. Coming from church on Candlemas day, 1394, she slipped on the ice and broke her hip, and for the rest of her life underwent terrible sufferings, which she endured with such incredible patience that she has been said to hold the same place in the dispensation of the New Testament that Job does in that of the Old. She had an altar erected in her chamber and during the last years of her life partook of holy communion every few days. She had many ecstatic visions, beholding hell, heaven, and purgatory. Pilgrims flocked to her bedside and many wonderful cures were said to have been performed. Her day in the Roman Catholic calendar is Apr. 14.

Bibliography: The early *Vitæ* are collected in *ASB*, Apr., ii. 270–365. One of them is in Fr. transl. by J. Bruchman, Besançon, 1840, and in Dutch by G. A. Meyer, Nimeguen, 1890. Consult: W. Moll, *J. Brugmann en het godsdienstig leven . . . in de 15. eeuw*, Amsterdam, 1854; *KL*, vii. 1974–79 (where other literature is given).

LIE: Any false statement made with intent to deceive, also any reservation, equivocation, or concealment of the truth for the purpose of misleading our neighbor. It is in this comprehensive sense that the divine command, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor," is to be interpreted. Christ designates the devil as the source of the lie and as the father of liars (John viii. 44); and after he had established the kingdom of truth upon earth (John xviii. 37) his disciples combatted falsehood with might and main (cf. Eph. iv. 25; Tit. i. 12–14). John expressly states that liars are excluded from the city of God (Rev. xxi. 8, xxii. 15). Attempts have been made to adduce Biblical examples of the "white lie," or "necessary lie" (*Notlüge*), but the prevarications of Abraham about Sarah (Gen. xii. 11–13, xx. 2), and the deceptions of David (I Sam. xxi. 2, 13, xxvii. 10) do not come under this category, not to speak of the lies of Sarah (Gen. xviii. 15) and Jacob (xxvii. 19). However, the Old Testament seems to endorse to a certain extent the kind of necessary deception employed by Rahab to save the spies in Jericho (Josh. ii.), and in a similar case by Michael (I Sam. xix. 13–17). Perhaps such deception is justifiable where a human life is at stake, or where a lie seems necessary to the accomplishment of some higher good; but even then it should be possible to surmount the difficulty without lying.

(Karl Burger†.)

LIEBNER, lîb′ner, **KARL THEODOR ALBERT:** German Lutheran theologian, of importance in the history of the newer constructive theology; b. at Schkölen, near Naumburg, Mar. 3, 1806; d. in Switzerland June 24, 1871. Along with the consciousness that in the modern critical period a special task was laid upon theological science, he found his life-work in the conviction that in order successfully to meet the ever-growing opposition there was requisite a wider development of the Christian ethical content; and that the first requisite was to give full play to the radically decisive ethical factor in Christianity and give it in contemporary ecclesiastical and scientific consciousness the place which it holds by intrinsic right in the Christian scheme.

After the completion of his education at Leipsic (marked by special attention to Kant) he was influenced by his further studies in Berlin (under Schleiermacher, Hegel, Neander, Marheineke), and by his reception into the Wittenberg Theological Seminary (under Heubner and Richard Rothe). It was here that he wrote his first book: *Hugo von St. Victor und die theologischen Richtungen seiner Zeit* (Leipsic, 1832), which is valuable for its exposition of the union of mysticism and *gnosis* before the Reformation in the school of St. Victor, and for its bearing on the struggles and aims of our time. This theme is continued in the treatise (in the *TSK*) *Ueber Gersons mystische Theologie*, which he composed in his first pastoral charge (Kreisfeld, near Eisleben), 1832, as well as in the academic treatise *Richardi a S. Victore de contemplatione doctrina*, which, along with some treatises on practical theology (1843–44), and some sermons, he published at Göttingen, whither he had been called in 1835 as professor of theology and university preacher.

Called in 1844 to Kiel, to succeed Dorner as professor of systematic theology, he wrote there his principal work, *Die christliche Dogmatik aus dem christologischen Princip dargestellt* (Göttingen, 1849). In Christ the God-man, Liebner finds the solution of the spiritual struggle of our time. Here, where the divine dwells in the human in bodily substance, he discerns the truth and fulness of religion, personally absolute religion; the ethical appears to him as the inmost and profoundest essence of Christianity, as its absolutely deepest and richest content, in fact the center-point of all things divine and human, the principle governing all manner of being and thought, in the immanent and permanent vital process in God and in the world. By the aid of this thought he sees how the conceptions men have of God and religion correspond; how subordinate and one-sided ideas of God can beget none but subordinate and partial ideas of religion: the physical conception of God as being, causality, and the like, begetting a mere physical conception of religion (feeling of dependency, of the infinite in the finite); the logical conception, a merely logical religion (perception, knowledge of the divine, etc.); the exclusively ethical conception of God, an exclusively ethical conception of religion (external positivism and moralism, formal orthodoxy and rationalism). In view of these partial ideas which dilute, if not disintegrate and dissolve, the essence of Christianity, Liebner brings to bear the entire force of contemplative and speculative reasoning in order to conceive as a whole the organic cooperation of the physical, logical, and ethical, and thereby to maintain the full, unmaimed, and undiluted effect of Christianity.

Starting from the principle of the Incarnation, Liebner now more lucidly exhibits the relation of faith and knowledge, showing how the one postulates and presupposes the other; how faith can as little be void of thought as can God; and how Christianity is a redemption both for mind and heart. Participation in the life of salvation is also participation in the ideas of salvation which are inseparably connected with it, every divine gift and grace is at the same time a task to be worked out by human effort; so we are to work out, as the proper content of thought, the salutary ideas immanent in the facts of salvation, under constant and formative guidance of God's word and of the Spirit who leads into all truth. As faith without works is dead, so is it also dead without knowledge. On the ground of such faith rests, for Liebner's theology, the certainty that theology itself, as the scientific self-consciousness of Christianity, must also find its scientific principles in its own peculiar content, the Gospel, with full confidence that the vital Christian fund of faith is susceptible of scientific elaboration. In this consciousness, his theology disarmed prejudices against faith on the one hand and knowledge on the other, by showing in the relation between God and the universe, Creator and creature, God and man, spirit and nature, freedom and necessity, etc., how the atomistic conception of diversity is unable to discern or comprehend the idea of unity; how it severs and dismembers unity, and is in the last analysis a conception of death and decay. He shows equally how the monistic conception of unity loses sight of and confounds diversity: whereas faith, when comprehended in its vital truth and depth, manifests itself as the deepest ground and motive for a truly organic philosophy, which does justice to both diversity and unity. These fundamental ideas are especially expanded in his *Introductio in dogmaticam christianam* (Leipsic, 1854–55), which he wrote at Leipsic, whither he had been persuaded to go after declining calls to Marburg and Heidelberg.

In 1855 he was appointed court preacher and vice-president of the Superior Consistory of Saxony. The manner in which he embraced this position as an opportunity to increase his already richly blessed labors appears from his writings: *Ueber das Wesen der Kirchenvisitation*, a memorial to the official visitors (1857); *Ueber den Stand der christlichen Erkenntnis in der deutschen evangelischen Kirche*, an address before the Conference at Eisenach in 1859, incidentally describing the constructive work of the new era (Dresden, 1860); his Reformation sermon in 1864; a second volume of sermons, *Predigt-Beiträge zur Förderung der Erkenntnis Christi in der Gemeinde* (1861), and the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* which he founded in conjunction with Dorner, Ehrenfeuchter, and others, for the support of his constructive theology.

Bibliography: M. M. Rüling, *Zur Erinnerung an . . . T. A. Liebner*, Dresden, 1871; C. Schwarz, *Zur Geschichte der neuesten Theologie*, pp. 371 sqq., Leipsic, 1864; A. Mücke, *Die Dogmatik des 19. Jahrhunderts*, pp. 280 sqq., Gotha, 1867.

LIETZMANN, lîts′mān, **HANS:** German Protestant; b. at Düsseldorf Mar. 2, 1875. He was educated at the universities of Jena (1893) and Bonn (1894–97; lic. theol., 1896), and after teaching in a gymnasium at Bonn in 1898–99, became privat-docent at the university in the same city in 1900. Since 1905 he has been professor of church history at Jena. He has edited *Kleine Texte für theologische Vorlesungen und Uebungen* (Bonn, 1902 sqq.; Eng. transl., *Materials for the Use of Theological Lecturers and Students*, Cambridge, 1902 sqq.) and *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* (in collaboration with H. Gressmann, E. Klostermann, F. Niebergall, and P. Wendland; Tübingen, 1906 sqq.), and has written: *Der Menschensohn* (Tübingen, 1896); *Catenen, Mitteilungen über ihre Geschichte und handschriftliche Ueberlieferung* (1897); *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule*, *i.* (1904); and *Das Leben des heiligen Simeon Stylites* (Leipsic, 1908).

LIFE AND ADVENT UNION. See Adventists, 4.

LIFTINÆ, SYNOD OF: The second Austrasian synod held during the reign of Carloman, apparently in 743, at Liftinæ, in the sixteenth century called Lestines, the modern Estinnes (7 m. s.e. of Mons), Belgium. Many things occur in its acts which do not really belong there, and others have scant independent value, being mere confirmations of the first Austrasian synod of the previous year. It marked an important step in advance, however, in that the principles of church government already fixed in the earlier synod were now more accurately defined as an adherence to primitive usage. Direct dependence on the canons of the earlier Fathers (i.e., the ecumenical councils) was expressly postulated and the attitude assumed toward unlawful marriages prepared the way for the entrance of the Roman code into the kingdom of the Franks. Still more important was the legal aspect, which was equally momentous for Church and State, inasmuch as it involved the moot question of the enormous secularization of the eighth century. They seem to have begun chiefly with Charles Martel, who invested laymen with bishoprics. After the death of Charles the process of restitution began in Austrasia, when the newly consecrated bishops were reinstated in the possessions of the Church, although the greater portion still remained in the hands of laymen as *precariæ*. In Neustria, on the other hand, those who held ecclesiastical estates retained their illegal property until the accession of Pepin, who gradually put an end to this state of affairs, partly by actual restitution and partly by the system of *precariæ* which he could revoke at pleasure, even though secularization was still practised to some extent both by him and Carloman.

The provisions of 742 and 743 are important as inaugurating a real, though limited, restitution and as guaranteeing a regular mode of procedure. At the synod Carloman reached an agreement with the bishops. Those who had received ecclesiastical fiefs from the king held them only for life, the bishoprics reverting to the Church at death, while the incumbents were required to pay taxes and to keep the buildings in repair. Even in case of reversion, however, the king could, if obliged by necessity, again grant a bishopric as a *precaria*, the clergy being obliged in the great majority of cases to obey the royal will. Yet the synod secured better conditions for the German Church than prevailed in Neustria, and neither the bishops nor the pope protested. In the latter years of his life Pepin promised that both the secular and regular clergy should retain their property, although this made no material change, the fiefs remaining in the same hands and the provisions for reversion being disregarded. Even at the end of the ninth century a great part of the property of the Church was in the hands of the king and had then been considered practically his own for a hundred years. The application of secularized ecclesiastical property, as established at Liftinæ, contributed in no small measure to the extension of the system of benefices, and this synod thus became important in its bearing on the development of the feudal system of the Middle Ages. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The decisions are given in *MGH., Leg.*, sectio ii. 1, p. 26, no. 11. Consult: G. Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, iii. 35 sqq., 8 vols., Kiel, 1844–78; P. Roth, *Geschichte des Benefizialwesens*, Erlangen, 1850; idem, *Feudalität und Unterthanenverband*, Weimar, 1863; idem, in *Münchner historisches Jahrbuch*, i (1865), 275; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iii. 525; Rettberg, *KD*, i. 306.

LIGGINS, JOHN: Protestant Episcopalian; b. at Nuneaton (9 m. n.e. of Coventry), Warwickshire, England, May 11, 1829. He was educated at the Episcopal Academy, Philadelphia, and the theological seminary at Alexandria, Va. He was ordered deacon in 1855 and ordained priest two years later. After being curate at the Church of the Ascension, New York City, for a short time in 1855, he went to China as a missionary, remaining in that country until 1859. He then spent a year in Japan, where he was the first Protestant missionary. Because of impaired health he returned to America in 1860, and has since devoted his energies to literary work. In addition to contributing to *The Spirit of Missions* from 1862 to 1900 and to the *American Church Sunday School Magazine* since 1885, he has written: *One Thousand Familiar Phrases in English and Japanese* (Boston, 1860); *Missionary Picture Gallery* (1870); *Oriental Picture Gallery* (1870); *England's Opium Policy* (New York, 1883); *Gems of Illustration from the Sermons and Writings of Rev. Dr. Guthrie* (1885); and *The Great Value and Success of Foreign Missions* (1889).

LIGHTFOOT, JOHN: English Biblical critic and Hebraist; b. at Stoke-upon-Trent (38 m. n. by w. of Birmingham), Staffordshire, Mar. 29, 1602; d. at Ely, Cambridgeshire, Dec. 6, 1675. After completing his education at Christ's College, Cambridge, he taught at Repton, Derbyshire, for two years and then took orders. Appointed curate of Norton-in-Hales, Shropshire, he became chaplain to the Hebraist Sir Rowland Cotton, who urged him to study Hebrew and other Semitic languages. He accompanied Cotton when he removed to London, and then became rector of Stone, Staffordshire, for about two years, but in 1628 changed his residence to Hornsey, Middlesex, in order to be able to consult the rabbinical collections at Sion College, London. During his residence at Hornsey he wrote his first work, dedicated to Cotton and entitled *Erubhin, or Miscellanies, Christian and Judaical, penned for Recreation at vacant Hours* (London, 1629). In the following year he was presented to the rectory of Ashley, Staffordshire, which he held twelve years, after which he settled in London and became rector of St. Bartholomew's. Presbyterian in his sympathies, he took the parliamentary side in the Civil War and was a member of the Westminster Assembly. After a year at St. Bartholomew's, he was appointed rector of Great Munden, Hertfordshire, and held it for the remainder of his life. In 1650 he was chosen master of St. Catharine Hall, Cambridge, and four years later became vice-chancellor. He again sided with the Presbyterians in the Savoy Conference of 1661, but accepted the Act of Uniformity in the following year. In 1667 he was appointed a prebendary at Ely. His Oriental library was bequeathed to Harvard College, but was burned in 1769.

Lightfoot was a prolific writer and is noteworthy as the first Christian scholar to call attention to the importance of the Talmud. His chief works, in addition to the one already mentioned, are as follows: *A Few and New Observations on the Book of Genesis* (London, 1642); *A Handful of Gleanings out of the Book of Exodus* (1643); *Harmony of the Four Evangelists among themselves and with the Old Testament* (3 vols., 1644–50); *Harmony, Chronicle, and Order of the Old Testament* (1647); *The Temple Service as it stood in the Days of our Saviour* (1649); *The Temple, especially as it stood in the Days of our Saviour* (1650); *Harmony, Chronicle, and Order of the New Testament* (1655); and the work which has done most to preserve his fame, *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ* (6 vols., Cambridge and London, 1658–1678). The first edition of his collected works, those originally in Latin translated into English, was edited by G. Bright and J. Strype, 2 vols. London, 1684; and a Latin edition, including those at first written in English, was prepared by J. Texellius, 2 vols., Rotterdam, 1686. A complete edition of his writings was made by J. R. Pitman, 13 vols., London, 1822–25. It should also be noted that Lightfoot revised the Samaritan version of the Pentateuch for Walton's Polyglot Bible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A *Life* is prefixed to the *Works*, ed. of 1684, and one may be found in vol. i. of the Pitman edition; D. M. Welton, *John Lightfoot, the English Hebraist*, London, 1878. Consult further: W. M. Hetherington, *History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines*, Edinburgh, 1878; A. F. Mitchell, *The Westminster Assembly; its History and Standards*, London, 1883; *DNB*, xxxiii. 229–231.

LIGHTFOOT, JOSEPH BARBER: English ecclesiastic and scholar; b. at Liverpool Apr. 13, 1828; d. at Bournemouth (6 m. s.w. of Christchurch), Hampshire, Dec. 21, 1889. He was the son of an accountant, and entered Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1847. In 1849 he became scholar of Trinity; 1851, B.A., senior classic, and chancellor's medalist; in 1852, fellow of Trinity; 1854 M.A., and was ordained deacon; 1854, was one of the founders of the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology;* 1857, tutor of Trinity; 1858, was ordained presbyter, and became select preacher in Cambridge; in 1861, Hulsean professor of divinity at Cambridge, and chaplain to the prince consort; 1862, was appointed examining chaplain to Bishop Tait of London, and honorary chaplain in ordinary to the queen; 1866 and 1869–79, examining chaplain to Tait, who had now become archbishop of Canterbury. From July, 1870, to Nov., 1880, he acted as one of the revisers of the English New Testament; from 1871 to 1879 was canon of St. Paul's, and in 1874 and 1875 select preacher at Oxford. In 1875 he gave up the Hulsean professorship and became Lady Margaret professor of divinity at Cambridge, with which was combined the rectory of Terrington St. Clement's, Norfolk; in 1875 he was made deputy clerk of the closet to the queen. On Apr. 25, 1879, he was consecrated bishop of Durham.

Lightfoot was shy and reserved, yet was very successful as a professor. The students flocked to his lectures and he held them by his rich thoughts, his wide knowledge, and his sympathetic and inspiring style of address. As a preacher in St. Paul's the same characteristics secured him a hearing. The fact is moreover not to be overlooked, that his four volumes of sermons are as good when read as when heard. In 1870 he showed his liking for church history by founding three scholarships, on the subject "in itself and in connection with general history." As bishop he gathered six or eight students at a time around him in his palace at Bishop Auckland, where the chaplains instructed them. He made it his aim to preach in every church in his diocese.

His work as canon of St. Paul's and his connection with Tait had prepared him for the charge of a diocese, and Durham was a very important one. He did all he could to prepare for the long-needed division of the diocese, and the necessary funds were at length secured for the foundation of the see of Newcastle; J. W. Pease, a Quaker, made the munificent gift of the estate of Benwell Tower as a residence for the new bishop. Then Lightfoot set to work to build the churches still needed in his diocese. At a meeting at Durham he declared that twenty-five churches and mission-rooms were needed and he subscribed a large sum himself; nearly £30,000 were subscribed in that meeting, and in five years twenty-five churches or mission chapels were built or building. As a thank-offering after the first seven years of his episcopate, he himself founded a church in the town of Sunderland. He furthered strongly the creation of a diocesan fund to unite all the foundations for church purposes in the diocese, for churches, schools, insurance, pensions for clergymen, and the like; his own share in it was £500 a year, and besides he left the greater part of his property to it. He increased the number of the rural deans, and appointed a second archdeacon in 1882. When at Terrington he had in 1878 and 1879 spent £2,140 to renew the chancel of the church, and at Durham he spent much money in beautifying the episcopal palace. He furthered in every way the temperance and White Cross movements.

In the year 1865 his commentary on Galatians came out (10th ed., London, 1892). Philippians came out in 1868 (10th ed., 1891), and Colossians and Philemon 1875 (3d ed., 1890). These volumes contained the Greek text, a very full commentary, and important special essays. His *Clement of Rome* appeared in 1869, an appendix with the new matter from Bryennios in 1877 (again in 1890 in two volumes). The *Apostolic Fathers* came out in two parts (Part I., vols. i., ii.; Part II., vols. i.–iii., 1885–1890). As a reviser he wrote *A Fresh Revision of the New Testament*, 1871 (2d ed., 1872, New York, 1873, 3d ed., with new appendix, London, 1891). He was against a half-hearted revision and opposed vigorously the use of the younger Greek text. His essays against Cassels' *Supernatural Religion* (see SUPERNATURAL RELIGION) appeared as a book in 1889. Five volumes of sermons, essays and notes have been published since his death. CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Bishop Lightfoot* (anonymous), London, 1894; *DNB*, xxxiii. 232–240; J. S. Stone, in *Church Review*, lxiii. 173 sqq.; F. W. Farrar, in *Contemporary Review*, lvii. 170 sqq., reproduced in *Magazine of Christian Literature*, i. 360; W. Sanday, in *English Historical Review*, v. 209 sqq.

LIGHTS, USE OF, IN WORSHIP: From very early times during service the altar has been lighted, even in day-time, at first generally by lamps, later by candles. In the fourth century the custom of giving distinction to religious functions by means of illumination appears to have been general. The reading of the Gospels, baptism, the celebration of the Lord's Supper, festivals such as Easter and Pentecost, the consecration of churches, the installation of bishops, etc., gave regular or extraordinary occasion therefor. The vigils especially offered a favorable opportunity. Indeed, even at an early period, the institution of the "eternal light" appears, indicating a still earlier date for the origin of the custom. The practical requirements of the early morning services, the primitive custom of celebrating the Eucharist in the evening, the employment of lamps in the ceremonies at the sepulchers in the catacombs, the religious significance given to light in the Bible and the example of the seven-branched candlestick rendered light a constituent of the liturgy as early as the third century. At first the altar was surrounded by candlesticks and hanging lamps; not until the twelfth century were the candlesticks placed upon the altar itself. There were in the Roman churches at an early period candlesticks of varied forms and of great material and artistic value. Paulus Silentiarius (ed. Becker, Bonn, 1837) describes the brilliant lighting of the St. Sophia in the time of Justinian. At the services for the dead also the use of lights was introduced at an early period.

In the medieval church this custom increased and became more definite, especially in the placing of candles before pictures and reliquaries, a custom which had its beginnings in Christian antiquity; in the Easter candles, in the so-called *Tenebræ* lights during Holy Week, and in the death lamps. The festival of Candlemas was created especially for the consecration of candles.

The lamps found in so great numbers in the catacombs were for private use; they are almost all of clay and were given an elongated form from the fourth century on. The base is ornamented in relief, both of a secular and religious character (V. Schultze, *Archäologie der altchristlichen Kunst*, pp. 292 sqq., Munich, 1895; M. Bauer, *Der Bilderschmuck frühchristlicher Thonlampen*, Greifswald, 1907). On the other hand the bronze lamps, preserved from Christian antiquity and distinguished by more graceful forms and a more artistic conception, must, in part, have served for ecclesiastical purposes. A complete change shows itself in the Middle Ages; lamps were not indeed entirely abandoned, but candlesticks, brackets, and candelabra took their place. The forms reflected the influence of Roman and Gothic art. The candlesticks with several, sometimes even with seven, branches are more impressive. For a brighter illumination of churches chandeliers were used at an early period. Prominent examples of this style are found in Hildesheim, Combourg, Aix-la-Chapelle, and other places. In the Gothic period the candelabra and chandeliers became more ornamental and more subject to the influence of architectural form; the Renaissance secularized the traditional forms. At the present day, in sympathy with the reaction in favor of medieval architecture, there is a return to the older designs. The Reformed Churches, from the beginning, rejected the use of altar-lights as papistical, while the Lutheran Church maintained the custom as it was.

VICTOR SCHULTZE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bingham, *Origines*, VIII., vi. 21, XI., iv. 14; XII., iv. 4; XVI., iv. 17; XX., viii. 5; XXIII., ii. 6; F. Bock, *Der Kronleuchter des Kaisers Friedrich Barbarossa*, Leipsic, 1864; W. Mühlbauer, *Geschichte und Bedeutung der Wachslichter bei den kirchlichen Funktionen*, Augsburg, 1874; C. Cahier, *Nouveaux mélanges d'archéologie*, pp. 188–228, Paris, 1875; V. Schultze, *Die Katakomben*, pp. 488 sqq., Leipsic, 1882; H. Otte, *Handbuch der kirchlichen Kunstarchäologie*, i. 156 sqq., Leipsic, 1883; C. Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe*, vi. 1–58, 8 vols., Paris, 1883–89; V. Thalhofer, *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik*, i. 666 sqq., Freiburg, 1887; S. Beissel, *Kunst und Liturgie in Italien*, pp. 247 sqq., Freiburg, 1899; H. Theilar, *The Candle as a Symbol and Sacramental in the Catholic Church*, New York, 1909; *DCA*, ii. 993–998, 1564.

LIGUORI, lî″gū-ō′rî, ALFONSO MARIA DI, AND THE REDEMPTORIST ORDER.

I. Alfonso Maria di Liguori.
  Early Life (§ 1).
  Foundation of the Redemptorist Order (§ 2).
  Episcopate and Later Life (§ 3).
  Moral, Pastoral, and Ascetic Works (§ 4).
  Dogmatic, Apologetic, and Homiletic Works (§ 5).
II. The Redemptorist Order.
  Early History (§ 1).
  Spread in Northern Europe (§ 2).
  Present Status (§ 3).
  Redemptorists in America (§ 4).

1. Early Life.

I. Alfonso Maria di Liguori. Alfonso Maria di Liguori, commonly known as St. Alphonsus, the most influential Roman Catholic moralist of the eighteenth century, was born at Marianella, a suburb of Naples, Sept. 27, 1696, and died near Nocera (8 m. n.w. of Salerno) Aug. 1, 1787. The third son of well-born and pious parents, he received an excellent education at the hands of the Oratorians. His progress in philosophical and legal studies was such that he took his doctor's degree at the age of seventeen, and began to practise law with every prospect of a brilliant career; but he deserted it in 1723 to prepare for the priesthood, which he received on Dec. 21, 1726, after a year spent in the Neapolitan house of the Propaganda. In 1729 he entered the Chinese College under the same direction, and devoted himself to the life of a missioner in southern Italy, founding pious associations to be directed by catechists appointed by himself. This part of his life was marked by visions and revelations, one of which, through a nun at Scala near Amalfi, directed him not to return to Naples, but to remain where he was for the purpose of founding a new order of mission-priests in aid of neglected souls. In pursuance of this admonition he proceeded (Nov. 9, 1732) to found the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer.

2. Foundation of the Redemptorist Order.

The new order was confined to the small town of Scala for two years, and its very existence was threatened by attacks from various quarters. The Propaganda expelled Liguori as a restless innovator, and the archbishop of Naples spoke unfavorably of the new undertaking. Only two of Liguori's original companions remained steadfast; but he went forward undiscouraged, and soon was able to establish a second house at Villa Schiavi in the diocese of Cajazzo, and a third (1735) at Ciorani in that of Salerno. The vows were first solemnly taken on July 21, 1742, when Liguori was unanimously elected superior-general for life. Papal confirmation was given by Benedict XIV. (Feb. 25, 1749), though the Neapolitan government refused to accept the brief. The order made rapid progress, especially in the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, where the founder was unwearied in missionary labors, his influence being seen not only in the foundation of new houses, but also in the winning of various classes of the community—the clergy, secular and regular, the nobility, the laboring classes, and even the prisoners in the jails—to participation in his spiritual exercises. He won his power over them partly by his ardent devotion and by the skilful tactics employed in his missions, and partly by mild treatment of penitents in the confessional, together with the habit of encouraging them to frequent reception of the Sacrament, both of which points were contrary to the rigorist practise of that part of the Italian clergy which was inclined to Jansenistic views.

3. Episcopate and Later Life.

In 1762, much against his will, Liguori was named by Pope Clement XIII. to the bishopric of Sant' Agata de' Goti. He turned over the direction of his congregation to a vicar-general, Andrea Villani, and applied his zeal to the care of his diocese, using every means to promote piety and education within it for thirteen years, until, on the ground of failing health, Pius VI. relieved him of the burden of the episcopate in 1775, after which he lived in ascetic retirement and poverty, refusing his episcopal pension, in the house of his order at San Michele de' Pagani near Nocera. His later years were troubled by a division in his order arising from the discord between the liberal Neapolitan government and Pius VI., and he did not live to see the reunion of the two branches into which it split. Nine years after his death the title of " Venerable " was conferred upon him by Pius VI.; he was beatified by Pius VII. in 1816, and canonized in 1839 by Gregory XVI.; while Pius IX. added his name to those of the doctors of the Church in 1871, and his works were specially commended by Leo XIII. in a brief of Aug. 28, 1879. It is easy to see why Liguori's teaching has been so acceptable to modern ultramontanism: the " learning and piety " commended in these papal utterances are closely allied to the Jesuit type of devotional literature and probabilist ethics, and he takes a strong stand in favor of the doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and papal infallibility. His works are nevertheless characterized, as might be expected from the rapidity of their production, by gross carelessness and inaccuracy in citations, as well as by unthinking acceptance of traditional errors and superstitions, as has been admitted by strict Roman Catholic critics in both the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries.

4. Moral, Pastoral, and Ascetic Works.

The theological works of Liguori may be divided into four principal groups: moral; pastoral and ascetic; dogmatic and apologetic; and homiletic. The principal work of the first class appeared first as a new edition of H. Busenbaum's *Medulla theologiæ moralis*, with notes by Liguori (Naples, 1748); the second edition, revised and greatly enlarged (2 vols., 1753–55), bears his name as author—*Theologia moralis, concinnata a R. P. Alphonso de Ligorio . . . per appendices in Medullam R. P. H. Busenbaum.* Nine editions in all appeared during Liguori's life, and the nineteenth century saw a large number of reprints, condensations, translations, etc., so that in one form or another the work is used as the basis of moral instruction in many Roman Catholic institutions. Other works in moral theology were the practical instructions for confessors, published first in Italian, *Istruzione e pratica per un confessore* (3 vols., Naples, 1757), and then in Latin, *Homo apostolicus, instructus ad audiendas confessiones* (Bassano, 1759); and certain controversial treatises in defense of his system, which until 1762 was simple probabilism, later developing into equiprobabilism (see Probabilism).

To the class of pastoral and ascetic theology belong, besides the *Homo apostolicus*, which may be classed under this head, the *Instructio ordinandorum* (Naples, 1758); *Institutio catechistica* (Bassano, 1768); *La vera sposa di Gesù Cristo*, for nuns (Venice, 1781); and a number of small vernacular tractates on devotion to the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, visits to the Blessed Sacrament, the Way of the Cross, etc. The best-known work of this class, much admired by Liguori's adherents and sharply attacked from the other side, is *Le Glorie di Maria* (2 vols., Naples, 1750), in which he follows the Jesuit Pepe in teaching what amounts to the thesis that the help of Mary is necessary to salvation, and supports it by a vast mass of uncritically accepted stories.

5. Dogmatic, Apologetic, and Homiletic Works.

The earliest of the dogmatic and apologetic writings of Liguori was the *Breve dissertazione contro gli errori dei moderni increduli*, written in 1756 and directed against the pantheism of Spinoza and the philosophy of Berkeley, Leibnitz, Wolf, etc. A more extensive work along the same lines appeared a year later under the title *Evidenza della fede, ossia verità della fede.* In 1767 he published a new edition of this in three books, in which besides materialism and English deism the French philosophers Helvetius and Voltaire were attacked, and in 1772 a fourth book was added against the deists. At short intervals appeared another series of polemical works: a Latin treatise (under the pseudonym Honorius de Honorio) against N. von Hontheim, *Vindiciæ pro suprema Romani pontificis potestate contra Justinum Febronium* (Naples, 1768), defending not only the primacy but the infallibility of the pope; *Opera dommatica contro gli eretici pretesi riformatori* (1769), a defense of the dogmatic decrees of the Council of Trent; the *Trionfo della chiesa* (3 vols., 1772), a history and refutation of heresies; and a work commending unity of religious belief in nations, enforced if necessary by their rulers, with special praise of the example of Louis XIV., *La Fedeltà de' vassalli verso Dio li rende fedeli anche al loro principe* (1777).

As a homilist Liguori began the publication of sermons for every Sunday and greater festival, in Italian, in 1769, and extended the series to four volumes, besides other smaller collections. As a religious poet and composer Liguori enjoyed some reputation. His " Recitative and Duet between the Soul and Jesus Christ " and " Passion Cantata " have recently been published, the former in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, xlix. 441, and the latter at Paris in 1900.

1. Early History.

II. The Redemptorist Order. The ascetic practises originally prescribed by Liguori for his followers were partially mitigated in the constitutions drawn up by him after 1742, but not a little of the primitive rigor remained in force. In common with the Jesuit order, from whom he borrowed a number of points, he prescribed a fourth vow in addition to the usual ones of poverty, chastity, and obedience—not to accept any dignity or benefice outside of the congregation except by the express command of the pope or the superior-general, and to remain in the congregation until death unless dispensed by the pope himself. The unconditional obedience to the infallible pope here expressed and taught in Liguori's writings led to difficulty in the later years of his life and brought about the division already alluded to. The Neapolitan branch was required by the government to submit to certain changes in the rule. No overt resistance was made, except by a few fathers who left their house at Illicetto and migrated to the Papal States. Pope Pius VI., however, required strict adherence to the statutes, and went so far as to declare the Neapolitan branch excluded from the congregation and deprived of its privileges, while Liguori himself was sentenced to deposition from his office as superior and to expulsion from the order. This harsh decision was obeyed in the Papal States and Sicily, while most of the Neapolitan members proved recalcitrant. Liguori himself yielded meekly and counseled obedience; but the breach was not healed until an accommodation was reached between Rome and Naples three years after the founder's death. In the autumn of 1790 the Neapolitan government for the first time recognized the bull of Benedict XIV. confirming the statutes, and in the next year Pius VI. sanctioned the reunion of the order.

2. Spread in Northern Europe.

Before Liguori's death, the extension of the congregation beyond the limits of central and southern Italy was planned out, and carried into effect under the auspices of Clemens Maria Hoffbauer, who is justly considered as the second founder of the order. He was born at Tasswitz in Moravia Dec. 26, 1751, and was at first a baker, but got a taste for theology and the beginning of his education at the Premonstratensian house of Bruck where he was employed, and after two years among the hermits of Mühlfrauen and a period of combined work at his trade and study in Vienna went to Rome, where, with two companions, he joined the Redemptorists in 1782. In 1785, having been ordained priest, he was sent to Vienna to found a house there, but on account of the Emperor Joseph's hostility went to Warsaw, where the congregation soon had two churches and before the end of the century twenty-five members. The work spread, and Hoffbauer was named vicar-general for Germany and Poland in 1792; but the Napoleonic wars destroyed what had been done, and Hoffbauer was obliged to go to Vienna, where at the time of the Congress he was the rallying-point of the reviving Catholicism, and contributed largely to keeping it Roman in opposition to the attempt to found an independent German Church. He died Mar. 15, 1820, and in the same year the order established a college and obtained possession of a church in Vienna under the guidance of Joseph Constantin Passerat, a Frenchman, Hoffbauer's most gifted disciple. The order continued to grow in Austria, and besides numerous houses for men began to establish some for women. The female branch is traced back to the early years of Liguori's ministry at Scala (see above), where the community under his guidance obtained papal confirmation in 1750; and he had founded a second house in 1766 in his see city of Sant' Agata. The Redemptorist nuns increased in number under Passerat's care and spread to Belgium, Holland, and France. The male order gained a rapid extension in the German states, especially in Bavaria, where it took the place of the Jesuits who had been expelled. It spread also to Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, France, England, and the United States. Their resemblance to the Jesuits, which in spite of some fundamental distinctions is an obvious one as to purpose and methods, brought about the exclusion of the Redemptorists from Germany during the Culturkampf from 1873 to 1894, when, on the motion of the Bavarian government, made after consulting the aged Döllinger, who declared that there was no essential connection between the two, and that the reasons which made the Jesuits dangerous to the State did not exist in the case of the younger order, the prohibition was removed. No other important obstacle to their growth came up in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

3. Present Status.

The congregation now numbers about 150 houses, divided into twelve provinces—three in Italy (Roman, Neapolitan, Sicilian); two German (northern or Rhenish-Westphalian and southern or Bavarian, the former with colonies in South America); one Austrian; one Belgian (with colonies in Canada and the West Indies); one Dutch (with a colony in Surinam); one French, including Spain and the western states of South America; one English, including Scotland, Ireland, and Australia; and two North American (Baltimore and St. Louis). The Paulist Fathers (see Paul the Apostle, Congregation of) may be considered an offshoot of the Redemptorists, the separate organization (established in 1858) having been intended to meet more closely special American conditions.

(O. Zöckler†.)

4. Redemptorists in America.

The first Redemptorist convent in the United States was established in Detroit in 1832, and such has been the development of the order that at present (1909) it comprises two independent provinces, viz., that of Baltimore and that of St. Louis. There are 38 convents and 2 colleges besides 2 novitiates and 2 houses of study. The total number of the fathers is 338, of the professed students and novices 111, lay brothers 124, lay novices and postulants 51. The Redemptorists have convents in most of the large cities, and, although parishes are generally conducted in connection with these houses, the fathers make a specialty of preaching-missions or retreats in parishes throughout the country. There are two vice-provinces of the order in the Dominion of Canada, viz., one attached to the Belgian province, the other to that of Baltimore; convents 9, fathers 68, novices 21, lay brothers 52.

Bibliography: Collections of the Works in Italian have been published: Monza, 1819; Venice, 1830; Naples, 1840; and 3 vols. at Turin, 1887 sqq.; in French at Tournai, 1895 sqq.; in German in 42 vols., Regensburg, 1842–1847; and in English in 22 vols., at New York, 1887–95 (vols. xxiii.–xxiv. contain the *Life*). A very complete collection of the "Letters" was made at Rome, 1887 sqq. On the life of Liguori consult the works by K. Dilgstrom, 2 vols., Regensburg, 1887 (the best); A. M. Tannoja, 3 vols., Naples, 1798–1802 (by a scholar of Liguori); Villecourt, 4 vols., Tournai, 1813; P. V. A. Gratini, Rome, 1815; Jeancard, Louvain, 1829; Rispoli, Naples, 1839; M. A. Hugues, Münster, 1857; Saintrain, Tournai, 1879; O. Gisler, Einsiedeln, 1887; G. Schepers, Mainz, 1887; A. Capecelatro, 2 vols., Rome, 1893; A. de Meffert, Mainz, 1901; A. des Retours, Paris, 1903; A. C. Berthe, St. Louis, 1906; *KL*, vii. 2023–52; and *Encyclopædia Britannica*, xiv. 634–639.

On the order consult: K. Mader, *Die Kongregation des heiligsten Erlösers in Oesterreich*, Vienna, 1887; F. Ratte, *Der heilige Alphonsus und der Redemptoristen-Orden*, Luxemburg, 1887; A. Zapf, *Die Redemptoristen*, Erlangen, 1894; F. Dumortier, *Les Premières Rédemptoristines*, Lille, 1884; M. A. Hugues, *Die Klosterfrauen Maria Victoria und Marianna*, Freiburg, 1883; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, ii. 313 sqq., 331 sqq., 498; Currier, *Religious Orders*, pp. 466 sqq., 673 sqq.

LILITH. See Demon, I., §§ 3–4.

LILLIE, JOHN: American Presbyterian; b. at Kelso (38 m. s.e. of Edinburgh), Roxburghshire, Scotland, Dec. 16, 1812; d. at Kingston, N. Y., Feb. 23, 1867. He was graduated at the University of Edinburgh (1831; D.D., 1855); studied theology, and taught until 1834, when he emigrated to America. He then finished his theological studies at New Brunswick, N. J., and was ordained minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church at Kingston, where he labored until he accepted the presidency of the grammar-school of the University of the City of New York (Aug., 1841). He had charge of the Broadway, afterward Stanton Street, Reformed (Dutch) Church (1843–48), and, in addition, edited the *Jewish Chronicle* (1844–48). He labored upon the revised version of the American Bible Union (1851–57); and in 1857 he reentered the pastorate, taking charge of the Presbyterian Church of Kingston. Lillie, who was acknowledged to be one of the best Biblical scholars in the United States, prepared for the American Bible Union valuable new versions and philological commentaries upon I–II Thessalonians, I–III John, II Peter, Jude, and Revelation (also on I Peter and James; but these were never printed). He wrote *Lectures on the Epistles to the Thessalonians* (New York, 1860); and translated, with additions, C. A. Auberlin and C. J. Riggenbach upon Thessalonians (in the Lange Commentary, 1868). His *Lectures on the First and Second Epistles of Peter, with a Biographical Sketch by Dr. Schaff and James Inglis* (1869) were published posthumously.

LIMBORCH, lim′bōrH″, **PHILIPPUS VAN:** Dutch Remonstrant theologian; b. at Amsterdam June 19, 1633; d. there Apr. 30, 1712. He was the son of a lawyer, Frans van Limborch, and Geertruida Bischop, a niece of Episcopius, and was educated at Leyden and Utrecht for the law, afterward, when he had made up his mind to become a Remonstrant minister (see REMONSTRANTS), studying under Vossius and Barlæus in Amsterdam. In 1657 he accepted a call to Gouda, and ten years later he returned to Amsterdam; but after a few months of pastoral ministry be became a professor in the Remonstrant seminary (Apr. 19, 1668). Here he held a position of influence for forty-five years, and his deep theological learning attracted many students. He was the leading Remonstrant theologian of the seventeenth century. His fame rests chiefly on his *Theologia Christiana ad praxin pietatis ac promotionem pacis christianæ unice directa* (Amsterdam, 1686; Eng. transl., *A Compleat System, or Body of Divinity*, 2 vols., London, 1713, republished, Macclesfield, 1807). He had a remarkable conversation with Isaac Orobio, a Spanish Jew who had been obliged to flee from the Inquisition and had established himself in Amsterdam as a physician, and published a report of it under the title *De veritate religionis christianæ, amica collatio cum erudito Judæo* (Gouda, 1687). Against the Roman Catholics he maintained the right of freedom in religious investigation, and himself showed a moderate and tolerant spirit toward those who differed from him. He shows little sympathy with the philosophy of his age—at least with Descartes and Spinoza—though he was much attracted by Locke's works and exchanged interesting letters with him. He wrote an excellent biography of Episcopius, and a short history of the Synod of Dort, as an introduction to the letters of the English delegates Hales and Balcanqual, besides editing the second part of the theological writings of Episcopius, the whole *Opera theologica* of Curcellæus, and the *Præstantium ac eruditorum virorum epistolæ theologicæ et ecclesiasticæ.* H. C. ROGGE†.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the works mentioned in the text, Limborch wrote *Historia Inquisitionis*, 2 parts, Amsterdam, 1692, Eng. transl. by S. Chandler, London, 1731. The funeral oration by J. Le Clerc was published Amsterdam, 1712, and is found in the transl. of the *Theologia Christiana*, ut sup. Consult: A. des Amorie van der Hoeven, *Dissertatio de Phil. a Limborch*, ib. 1843; Niceron, *Mémoires*, xi. 39 sqq.; C. F. Stäudlin, *Geschichte der theologischen Wissenschaften*, i. 297 sqq., ii. 87 sqq., Göttingen, 1810–11, Eng. transl., *Hist. of Theological Knowledge and Literature*, Edinburgh, 1835.

LIMBUS: A name applied in Roman Catholic theology to a place of detention for such souls as are incapable, through no fault of their own, of entrance into heaven. Outside of hell (see FUTURE PUNISHMENT), the prison of those who have died in stubborn enmity against God, it is taught that there are three places of detention: Purgatory (q.v.) for those who are in process of purification to render them fit for heaven; the *Limbus patrum*, or place where those who died before the Atonement were detained; and the *Limbus infantium* (or *puerorum*), where the souls of infants dying without baptism are. It is taught that there is no actual suffering in the two latter places, and thus, although the souls therein are excluded from the Beatific Vision, they are at the opposite extreme of the " under-world " from hell—on its border (*limbus*). The *Limbus patrum* is held to have ceased to exist when Christ " went and preached unto the spirits in prison " (I Pet. iii. 19; see DESCENT OF CHRIST INTO HELL). The state of infants in the *Limbus infantium* is regarded as one of complete natural happiness; of the supernatural bliss of heaven they have not been made capable by baptism. See INFANT SALVATION.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The subject is treated in the literature under the articles to which reference is made in the text—FUTURE PUNISHMENT; PURGATORY, etc.

LINCK (LINK, LINCK VON COLDITZ), WENCESLAUS (WENZEL, VINCILAUS): Lutheran preacher and theologian; b. at Colditz (25 m. s.e. of Leipsic) Jan. 8, 1483; d. at Nuremberg Mar. 12, 1547. In 1498 he entered the University of Leipsic, then joined the Augustinian friars, and in 1503 went to Wittenberg to continue his studies, where, six years later, he lectured on the " Sentences " of Peter Lombard, and was dean of the faculty when Luther took his doctor's degree in 1512. In the following years he was temporary prior of the Augustinian monastery in Wittenberg while Luther was its subprior; and the sermons which he preached at that time were praised by Luther for their popularity and fertility of imagination. When his activity at Wittenberg terminated in 1516, Linck accompanied his patron Staupitz on several tours of visitation, and in 1517 was called as preacher to Nuremberg. The sermons which he delivered there, especially on Palm Sunday and in Advent, 1518, show the consciousness of the Reformation struggling to gain expression. All Linck's work was done in Luther's spirit, and the monastery of the Augustinians at Nuremberg became one of the earliest strongholds of the new creed, while he himself took an active part in the negotiations between Cardinal Cajetan and Luther. When Staupitz resigned as vicar-general of the German Augustinians in 1520, Linck was chosen to fill his place, and in this capacity made visitations in Thuringia and Saxony. In spite of his rather delicate position, he remained faithful to Luther and his cause. In 1521 he started from Munich on an extensive visitation, in the course of which he became acquainted with Albrecht Dürer in Antwerp. On his return he found the public mind agitated over the question of monasticism which the fanatics wished to reject altogether. In his perplexity Linck asked the advice of Luther, and the latter sought to defend his point of view by appealing to the Gospels, although he did not approve of the lawless methods of the innovators. In 1522 Linck convoked a chapter at Wittenberg in which Luther's standpoint was generally adopted, since it was maintained that the Bible transcended human authority and tradition, and that each one might leave the monastery at his own will, while other anti-Catholic teachings were also adopted. A second chapter was convoked by Duke George a few months later at Grimma to restrict the measures adopted at Wittenberg, but it was too late. Whole convents were in a state of dissolution, and Linck was powerless to stay the tendency of the time, while he was forced to bear the responsibility for the Wittenberg resolutions, thus rendering his position as provincial more and more untenable. At this time Elector Frederick offered Linck the position of Evangelical preacher at Altenburg, and after long hesitation he resigned his position as provincial and entered upon his new calling in 1523. The Roman Catholics still predominated in Altenburg and the churches were in their hands, so that Linck could not execute the regular functions of the ministry, but was obliged to content himself with preaching. Within a short time, however, the Evangelicals had acquired the right to share in the use of the Church of St. Bartholomew, while in 1523 communion was celebrated in both kinds and the first Lutheran baptism in the German language took place. Linck, who in the mean time had married, did all in his power, by sermons as well as by treatises, to further the Lutheran cause, so that other churches were soon ceded to the Lutherans and he began to organize a regular system. He paid special attention to the reform of education, the relief of the poor, and the suppression of begging. In 1525 he was called as preacher to Nuremberg, his second period of activity here lasting almost twenty-two years. In the beginning he was involved in the question of the remarriage of clergymen who were widowers, then agitating Luther and other Evangelical theologians. Provost Dominicus Schleupner of St. Sebald in Nuremberg had married again after the death of his first wife, and his action had caused some sensation. In Nuremberg twenty-eight anonymous theses attacked him, and Luther was asked to reply, his own treatise on the subject, as well as one by Osiander and Linck, being circulated widely throughout the city. Linck's arguments were noteworthy for their clear and moderate tone and laid stress upon the theory that ministers have no requirements of morality and sanctity other than those binding on the Christian laity.

In 1524 Nuremberg had broken definitely with the Roman Catholic Church, and in Mar., 1525, the Lutherans held a conference which closed the monasteries and issued calls to Evangelical preachers. At first Linck preached at the monastery of St. Catharine, but was called within the same year (1525) to the position of first preacher in the Church of the Holy Ghost. There again, as in Altenburg, he manifested much zeal in strengthening the Evangelical cause. Sermons for children were introduced in his church, and the rooms of the Augustinian monastery were changed into a high school. At the same time Linck took an active part in polemical writings against the Anabaptists and against non-Lutheran interpretations of the Lord's Supper. He was also involved in repeated disputes with Osiander, but his friendship with Luther always retained its old intimacy. In 1539 Linck received a call to Leipsic, but declined it, on the advice of Luther. In the following year, after his reconciliation with Osiander, the pair took part in the colloquies of Hagenau and Worms, but Osiander again went too far in his vehemence and invectives, so that he was immediately recalled, and both were reprimanded at their return.

Among the numerous writings of Linck, special mention may be made of the following: *Artikel und Positionen* (Grimma, 1523), a pamphlet dating from the time of his activity at Altenburg and containing a concise summary of his teachings; *Vom Reiche Gottes* (1524); *Unterrichtung der Kinder, so zu Gottes Tische gehen wollen* (1528), *Das Ave Maria, wie mans christlich gebrauchen und die Kinder lehren soll* (1531); *Bapstsgespreng; aus dem Ceremonien-Buch* (Strasburg, 1539); and *Auslegung des Alten Testaments* (1543–45). (R. BENDIXEN†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Dr. W. Reindell began the collection of Linck's *Werke*, vol. i., Marburg, 1894, and has also written *Doktor Wenzeslaus Linck von Colditz*, part i., ib. 1892. The life by H. W. Caselmann is in M. Meurer, *Leben der Altväter der lutherischen Kirche*, Leipsic, 1863. A very rich list of literature is given in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xi. 505–506.

LINDSAY, THOMAS MARTIN: United Free Church of Scotland; b. the son of Rev. A. Lindsay, 1843. He received his education at the University of Edinburgh; became examiner to the same institution, where he was later assistant to the professor of logic and metaphysics; became professor of church history in the Free Church College, Glasgow, 1872; and principal of the United Free Church College, Glasgow, 1902. He was also for fifteen years convener of the Foreign Mission Committee of the Free Church of Scotland. Among his publications are handbooks on Acts (Edinburgh, 1884–85), Mark (1884), Luke (1887), and on the Reformation (1882); *Luther and the German Reformation* (1900); *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries* (Cunningham lectures, London, 1902); and *History of the Reformation* (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1906–07).

LINDSEY, THEOPHILUS: English Unitarian; b. at Middlewich (21 m. e. of Chester) June 20, 1723; d. in London Nov. 3, 1808. He was educated at Leeds and at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he was elected fellow in 1747. He became curate of a chapel in Spital Square, London, and shortly afterward was made chaplain to the duke of Somerset, to whose son, the future second duke of Northumberland, he was tutor from 1750 to 1753. He was then presented to the rectory of Kirkby Wiske, Yorkshire, but resigned three years later to become rector of Piddletown, Dorset. In 1762 he declined the proffered chaplaincy to the duke of Northumberland, and in the following year accepted the rectory of Catterick, Yorkshire. Meanwhile the latitudinarianism which had hitherto characterized him had become Unitarianism, largely through the influence of his wife's stepfather, Archdeacon Francis Blackburne. On Nov. 28, 1773, he preached his farewell sermon at Catterick and went to London, where he began to preach Unitarianism, a permanent chapel being opened for him in 1778; he remained there until his resignation in 1793. His chief works are: *The Book of Common Prayer Reformed* (London, 1774); *Apology on Resigning the Vicarage of Catterick, Yorkshire* (1774); *A Sequel to the Apology* (1776); *The Catechist, or an Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Scriptures concerning the Only True God* (1781); *Historical View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship* (1783); *Vindiciæ Priestleyanæ* (2 parts, 1784–90); *Conversations on Christian Idolatry* (1792); and *Conversations on the Divine Government* (1802).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: T. Belsham, *Memoirs of Revd. T. Lindsey, Centenary Volume*, London, 1873; *DNB*, xxxiii. 317, 318.

LINES, EDWIN STEVENS: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Newark, N. J.; b. at Naugatuck, Conn., Nov. 23, 1845. He was educated at Yale (A.B., 1872) and at Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn., from which he was graduated in 1874. He was ordered deacon and priested in the latter year, and was then rector successively of Christ Church, West Haven, Conn. (1874–79), and of St. Paul's, New Haven, Conn. (1879–1903). In 1903 he was consecrated bishop of Newark.

LINGARD, JOHN: Roman-Catholic historian; b. at Winchester Feb. 5, 1771; d. at Hornby (9 m. e.n.e. of Lancaster), Lancashire, July 13, 1851. He studied at the English College at Douai from 1782 to 1793, but fled from France on account of the Revolution and returned to England as tutor in the family of Lord Stourton. There he remained until, in 1794, he went to Crookhall, near Durham, where some of those driven from Douai had gathered, and completed his theological studies. He was ordained priest in 1795, and, having declined a flattering call to London, taught natural and moral philosophy in Crookhall, where he was also vice-president and prefect of studies. In 1808 the college was removed to Ushaw, Durham, and he accompanied it. In 1810 he was chosen president, but in the following year retired to Hornby, where he spent the remainder of his life, devoting himself to historical studies and declining both the professorship of Sacred Scripture and Hebrew at the Royal College of St. Patrick at Maynooth and the presidency of the seminary at Old Hall Green. In 1817 and 1825 he visited Rome and was received with great distinction, some believing that his appointment as a cardinal was reserved *in petto*.

The chief works of Lingard were as follows: *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church* (2 vols., Newcastle, 1806; 3d ed., practically a new work, under the title *The History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, 2 vols., London, 1845); *Collection of Tracts on several Subjects connected with the Civil and Religious Principles of the Catholics* (London, 1813); *History of England, from the first Invasion by the Romans to the Accession of William and Mary in 1688* (8 vols., 1819–30; 6th ed., 10 vols., 1854–55); *Supplementum ad Breviarium Romanum adjectis officiis Sanctorum Angliæ* (1823); *A new Version of the Four Gospels* (1838); and *Catechetical Instructions on the Doctrine and Worship of the Catholic Church* (1836). His *History* is characterized by accuracy, care, and impartiality, although he was charged by extreme Protestants with perversion of the truth and by extreme Roman Catholics with undue concessions to the Protestants.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Gillow, *Bibliographical Dictionary of Eng. Catholics*, iv. 254–278, London, n. d.; *DNB*, xxxiii. 320–323 (with citation of scattered references).

LINUS: The immediate successor of St. Peter according to all lists of Roman bishops, although the duration of his office is very uncertain. In his church history, Eusebius counts twelve years, but fourteen in his chronicle; the *Catalogus Liberianus* assigns him twelve years, four months and twelve days, and Jerome eleven years. The date of the beginning of his pontificate is also differently fixed according to the varying calculations of the death of St. Peter. As the Roman Church knew nothing about an episcopal constitution in the beginning of the second century, Linus, if he actually existed, was simply a presbyter of the Church, but when, to combat heresies, a continuous succession of bishops was assumed from the Apostle Peter, he was made a bishop in the later sense, and identified with the Linus of II Tim. iv. 21. His alleged epitaph is generally recognized as possessing no historic value. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: R. A. Lipsius, *Die Papstverzeichnisse des Eusebius und der von ihm abhängigen Chronisten*, Kiel, 1869; idem, *Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe*, ib. 1869; J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part I., *S. Clement of Rome*, i. 201 sqq., London, 1890; Harnack, in *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1892; idem, *Litteratur*, ii. 1, pp. 70 sqq.; Bower, *Popes*, i. 4–5; *DCB*, iii. 726–729.

LINZ, lints, **PEACE OF:** A treaty concluded Dec. 16, 1645, at Linz (98 m. w. of Vienna) between the Emperor Ferdinand III., as king of Hungary, and George Rakoczy, prince of Transylvania. It is important as forming one of the legal bases of the Evangelical Church in Hungary. The Protestant Rakoczy, who aimed to secure the Hungarian throne, formed an offensive and defensive alliance with Sweden and France in Apr., 1643, against Ferdinand, and was aided by the Sublime Porte, of which he was a vassal. Alleging the grievances of his countrymen and especially the oppression of the

Protestants, he levied a large army, which he placed under the leadership of Johannes Kemenyi, while Sweden sent him troops led by Dugloss and France supplied him with funds. Despite success at first, Rakoczy found it advisable to open negotiations with his opponents in Oct., 1644. In December Ferdinand won the Turkish government over to his side, and Rakoczy succeeded in inducing Ferdinand to accept his terms, which dealt chiefly with the unrestricted liberty of the Hungarian Church, the treaty being confirmed by Rakoczy at Weissenburg Oct. 20, 1646. By its terms he bound himself to withdraw from the Franco-Swedish alliance, to remove his forces from the imperial domains, and to restore the districts and cities which he had taken. In return, he and his sons received two heritable counties and five for life. The most important portion of the treaty, however, was the granting of religious freedom to the Evangelical Church in Hungary. The unrestricted use of their churches, bells, and burial-places was granted to the Protestants; those who had been compelled to accept Roman Catholicism were to be permitted to return to their former beliefs; pastors and preachers could no longer be expelled from their charges, and those who had been driven out might either be reinstated or replaced by others of their own persuasion. Churches which had been confiscated from the Protestants were to be restored, but this clause, affecting 400 buildings, roused such opposition on the part of the Jesuits that the Protestants were obliged to content themselves with ninety. Supplementary articles in the treaty enacted a fine of 600 florins for violations of its provisions concerning the Protestants. The diet which considered the final details of this treaty, so important for the Protestants of Hungary, did not adjourn until July 17, 1647. (K. Klüpfel†.)

Bibliography: I. Katona, *Historia critica regum Hungariæ*, xxii. 232 sqq., 42 vols., Budapest, 1779–1817; J. Dumont, *Corps universal diplomatique du droit des gens*, vi. 1, pp. 331 sqq., 8 vols., The Hague, 1726–31; J. Mailath, *Die Religionswirren in Ungarn*, i. 30 sqq., Regensburg, 1845; *Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche in Ungarn*, pp. 199 sqq., Berlin, 1854; Szilagyi, *Actes et documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'alliance de G. Racoczi avec les Français el les Suédois*, Budapest, 1874; S. Linberger, *Geschichte des Evangeliums in Ungarn*, pp. 57 sqq., ib. 1880.

LIPPE, lip′pe (**LIPPE-DETMOLD**): A principality of northwestern Germany; capital Detmold; area 469 square miles; population (1905) 145,577, of whom 139,127 were Reformed or Lutherans, 5,477 Roman Catholics, and 735 Jews. Lippe became Christian in the time of Charlemagne, and, like other German states, it was dominated throughout the Middle Ages by the papacy. Some of the cities of the principality early accepted the Reformation, particularly Lemgo, which adopted the Brunswick church order in 1533; and in 1538 a church order that had been worked out by two Lutheran clergymen at the instance of the regents of Lippe was accepted by the nobility and the cities. Through the Interim (q.v.) the reform movement suffered a reverse; but in 1571 Count Simon VI. introduced a new church order which recognized as binding the Augsburg Confession and its Apology, the Schmalkald Articles, and Luther's catechism. Later Count Simon went over to the Reformed faith. Throughout the country and in the cities, with the exception of Lemgo, the Heidelberg catechism now replaced that of Luther; and in 1584 a Reformed church order was introduced. The Reformed Church, which numbers forty-one parishes, now has a modern synodal constitution. The Lutheran Church, with five parishes, is under the state consistory at Detmold, forming a synodal district of its own. The Roman Catholic Church numbers ten congregations, which are under the bishop of Paderborn. There are all together some fifty beneficent institutions in the principality, including the Sophienhaus at Salzuflen, the Rettungshaus at Grünau, and the state Diakonissenanstalt at Detmold. There are gymnasia at Detmold and Lemgo, a Realschule at Salzuflen, and a seminary for teachers at Detmold, as well as several city high schools for girls. There are 126 Evangelical elementary schools, eleven Roman Catholic schools, and ten Jewish schools (F. H. Brandes.)

Bibliography: O. Preuss and A. Falkmann, *Lippische Regesten*, 5 vols., Detmold, 1860 sqq.; H. Clemen, *Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte in Lippe*, Lemgo, 1860; A. Dreves, *Geschichte der Kirchen . . . des lippischen Landes*, ib. 1881; A. Falman, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Fürstentums Lippe*, Detmold, 1902; J. Freisen, *Staat und katholische Kirche in Lippe*, Stuttgart, 1906.

LIPSCOMB, lips′cum, **ANDREW ADGATE:** American Methodist Protestant divine and educator; b. at Georgetown, D. C., Sept. 6, 1816; d. at Athens, Ga., Nov. 24, 1890. He was licensed to preach in 1834, and remained in the ministry till 1849 when failing health compelled him to resign. He then opened an academy for young ladies at Montgomery, Ala. He was president of the Female College at Tuskegee, Ala. (1856–59), chancellor of the University of Georgia (1860–74), and professor of art and criticism in Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. (1874–85). Among his works are: *The Social Spirit of Christianity* (Philadelphia, 1846); *Studies in the Forty Days between Christ's Resurrection and Ascension* (Nashville, 1884); and *Studies Supplementary to the Studies in the Forty Days between Christ's Resurrection and Ascension* (Nashville, 1885).

LIPSIUS, lip′sî-us, **FRIEDRICH REINHOLD:** German Protestant; b. at Jena Oct. 3, 1873. He was educated at the universities of Leipsic and Jena from 1893 to 1897 (lic. theol., Jena, 1898); was assistant pastor at Weimar (1897–98); privatdocent for systematic theology at the university of Jena (1898–1906); became in 1906 pastor of St. Martini-Kirche, Bremen. He has edited R. A. Lipsius' *Glauben und Wissen* (Berlin, 1897), and has written *Vorfragen der systematischen Theologie* (Freiburg, 1899); *Kritik der theologischen Erkenntnis* (1904); and *Die Religion des Monismus* (Berlin, 1907).

LIPSIUS, RICHARD ADELBERT: German Protestant theologian; b. at Gera (34 m. s.s.w. of Leipsic) Feb. 14, 1830; d. at Jena Aug. 19, 1892. He descended from a family of Saxon theologians, and received his early education from his grandfather, A. G. W. Lipsius, preacher in Bernstadt, and in the " Thomana " of Leipsic where his father was teacher of religion. In 1848 he entered the University of Leipsic. Though he came successively under the influence of Fichte, Hegel, and Kant, the teachings of Schleiermacher and Rothe and the tenets of the Congregation of Brethren kept him from a one-sided moralism and induced him "to preserve a place for religious mysticism in the sanctuary of his heart." While Lipsius during the time of his studies stood for the views of the "mediating theology," he later followed the tendencies of historical criticism. The spirit of free investigation which he inherited from his father and his study of the writings of Baur exercised an irresistible influence upon him, although he was not a slavish follower of the latter. In 1855 he established himself as privat-docent at the University of Leipsic, and four years later was appointed adjunct professor there; in 1861 he was called to Vienna as professor of systematic theology, and in 1863 became a member of the Austrian Council of Education; in 1864 he was chosen deputy of the faculty to the first general synod and cooperated in the establishment of a liberal church constitution. The obdurate refusal of the government to incorporate the theological faculty in the university induced Lipsius in 1865 to accept a call to Kiel. At the Kiel assembly of 1867 he showed himself a champion of the Prussian Union. A polemical encounter with Bishop Koopmann, the head of the Holstein Lutherans, induced him to give up his position in Kiel, and to accept in 1871 a call to Jena, where he remained until his death. Besides his studies, he took a prominent part in the practical questions of the day, and was one of the founders of the Evangelical Alliance.

He devoted himself to the study of the documents of primitive Christianity and published numerous works on them. It was not as a historian, however, that he became the acknowledged leader of Jena theology, but as a systematic theologian. In his theological system he starts from the standpoint of the critical (though not unreservedly Kantian) theory of perception. He admits that perception of objects is subjectively conditioned, but rejects Kant's dualism of phenomena and "things-in-themselves"; he rather holds that by thought an objective order of law is grasped, and, applying the same contrast in the sphere of the philosophy of religion, he distinguishes between final and absolute being. The latter receives a positive content only through religious experience. The truth of religious concepts can not be demonstrated philosophically, but the unity of the human spirit demands the blending of the scientific and religious perceptions into a harmonious whole. In this connection metaphysics as a theory of the universe is indispensable, but the harmonious blending of those two perceptions can succeed only approximately, as may be seen from the idea of God; the scientific definitions remain here always negative, and the religious definitions figurative. No supernatural interference breaks the coherent development of the world, and that which on the basis of an inner need becomes for the religious man a divine revelation, represents for science nothing but a psychic phenomenon. The relation between God and man remains a holy "mystery." Hence it is evident that dogmatics is not a science without presuppositions, but can represent faith only from the standpoint of faith, although in a purified form.

Among the works of Lipsius may be named: *Die paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre* (Leipsic, 1853); *De Clementis Romani epistola ad Corinthios priore disquisitio* (1855); *Ueber das Verhältnis der drei syrischen Briefe des Ignatios zu den übrigen Recensionen der Ignatianischen Litteratur* (1859); *Der Gnosticismus, sein Wesen, Ursprung und Entwickelungsgang* (1860); *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanios* (Vienna, 1865); *Die Papstverzeichnisse des Eusebios und der von ihm abhängigen Chronisten kritisch untersucht* (Kiel, 1868); *Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe bis zur Mitte des vierten Jahrhunderts* (1869); *Die Pilatus-Acten kritisch untersucht* (1871); *Glaube und Lehre, Theologische Streitschriften* (1871); *Die Quellen der römischen Petrus-sage kritisch untersucht* (1872); *Die Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte* (Leipsic, 1875); *Lehrbuch der evangelisch-protestantischen Dogmatik* (Brunswick, 1876); *Dogmatische Beiträge zur Vertheidigung und Erläuterung meines Lehrbuches* (Leipsic, 1878); *Die edessenische Abgar-sage kritisch untersucht* (Brunswick, 1880); *Die Apokryphen, Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden* (1883–90); *Philosophie und Religion* (Leipsic, 1885). In connection with *Die Apokryphen, Apostelgeschichten*, Lipsius edited together with M. Bonnet the Greek and Latin texts (*Acta apostolorum apocrypha, part i., Acta Petri, Pauli, Petri et Pauli, Pauli et Theclae, Thaddaei*, Leipsic, 1891, by Lipsius alone). He further published *Hauptpunkte der christlichen Glaubenslehre* (2 ed., Brunswick, 1891) and *Glauben und Wissen* (ed. F. R. Lipsius, Berlin, 1897). He founded in 1875 and edited the *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, and from 1885 was editor of the *Theologischer Jahresbericht*.

(F. R. Lipsius.)

Bibliography: G. Richter and F. Nippold, *Zwei Gedächtnisreden*, Jena, 1893; A. Neumann, *Grundlagen und Grundzüge der Weltanschauung von . . . Lipsius*, Brunswick, 1896; E. Pfennigsdorf, *Vergleich der dogmatischen Systeme von . . . Lipsius und . . . Ritschl*, Gotha, 1896; U. Fleisch, *Die . . . Grundlagen der dogmatischen Systeme von A. E. Biedermann und . . . Lipsius*, Berlin, 1901; H. Lüdemann, in Addition to *Münchener allgemeine Zeitung*, xcii., no. 200; Ecke, in *Kirchliche Monatsschrift*, xciv. 798–817. Further references are given in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xi. 520.

LITANY.

Greek Church (§ 1).
Roman Catholic Church (§ 2).
Churches of the Reformation (§ 3).

1. Greek Church.

The Litany is a prayer of supplication, especially in responsive form. With the Greeks *litaneia* denotes a processional prayer, an act of prayer connected with the procession, or the procession itself. The term is used in the first sense by Chrysostom, Eustratius (6th cent.), Simeon of Thessalonica (d. 1429), and Codinus, while it denotes the procession in the *Chronicon Paschale*, Malalas, Georgius Cedrenus, and Michael Glycas. In the acts of the fifth Council of Constantinople, as well as in Philotheus, Simeon of Thessalonica, and Theodorus Lector, it designates the prayer connected with the procession, which here implies not only the procession outside the church but also the passing of light-bearers, priests, deacons, and choristers to the *narthex*, where the litany was recited, a usage established as early as the Council of Constantinople in 536. This custom still continues, and in this minor procession the litany is recited at the close of the great vespers before the chief feasts, and also in such processions as those of burial. This litany, also called *ectene*, or "deacon's litany," is essentially the prayer for the whole Church found in the ancient Oriental liturgies (*Apostolic Constitutions*, viii., and the liturgies of Mark and James) and is recited as a Bidding Prayer (q.v.) by the deacon, the congregation responding with the ejaculation *Kyrie eleison*, "Lord have mercy" (see LITURGICS, III., § 5). The processional litany is distinguished from the *ectene* of the mass by its invocation of the Virgin, St. John the Baptist, the Apostles, the great high priests, and all saints, as well as by the very frequent repetition of the ejaculation "Lord, have mercy!" The litany is recited by the deacon and the response is sung by the choir.

2. Roman Catholic Church.

In the Roman Catholic Church the term litany has several connotations. The invocation *Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison* and the supplications in the ancient liturgy made at the bidding of the deacon, corresponding to the Greek *ectene*, are both called litany, although the latter was technically known as the deprecation. The term litany was frequently applied to the processions of supplication, and a distinction was accordingly drawn between the "greater litany" on St. Mark's Day (Apr. 25) and the "lesser litanies" which are recited on the three Rogation Days (q.v.). The word was likewise employed with extreme frequency in its modern connotation of the responsive prayer beginning with *Kyrie eleison*, and this use finally gained supremacy, the term litany as a designation of a circuit with prayer being superseded by "procession" about the twelfth century. The older designation of the processions as litanies was retained, however, in the "greater litany" and the "lesser litanies," the former being a substitute for the pagan *robigalia* or festival of Apr. 25, and apparently instituted by Pope Liberius (352–366) rather than by Gregory the Great, and the latter the survival of the Roman *ambarvalia* or procession around the fields. The custom of processions, which had almost fallen into desuetude, was revived by Mamertus about 470, while Leo III. (795–816) reorganized the spring rogations according to Gallic usage and introduced them throughout the Catholic Church. The name "greater" and "lesser," the former denoting a procession of one day and the latter of three, is explained by the relative antiquity of the two.

The origin of the form of prayer now known by the name of litany is uncertain. It is usually assumed that it is a development and transformation of the Greek *ectene*, although the hypothesis has been advanced that its long lists of saints and its response "pray (or, intercede) for us," are survivals of the formula recited by the Pontifex Maximus according to the *indigitamenta*, or old books of direction for worship, so that they can not be older than the fourth century; but no corresponding formularies can be cited from the *indigitamenta*. It is not impossible that the Western procession (in contradistinction to the oriental) was not a development of the prayer called litany, but had an independent origin, which seems to have been derived from pagan models. Later the processional litany was amplified from the "deacon's litany" and was separated from the procession, although this litany was most tenacious in places where a procession once actually existed. The litany usually began with the invocation *Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison*, or "Christ, hear us," which preceded the invocation of the saints, the people responding after each name "pray for us." Certain perils and dangers were then enumerated, to which the congregation responded with the deprecation "Lord, deliver us," and these were followed by a series of petitions for blessings with the response "hear us, we beseech thee," the whole concluding with the *Agnus Dei* (q.v.) and the *Kyrie eleison*. This general scheme was modified in many ways. The names of the saints invoked varied according to place and circumstance, and the litany, according to the number of times each was invoked, was termed ternary, quinary, and septenary.

The litany was essentially penitential, and it never lost this character, whence it was frequently connected with the seven penitential Psalms. It was extraordinarily popular and was used on the most varied occasions, such as the blessing of the baptismal water on Holy Saturday, the dedication of a church, ordination, coronation, baptism, confession, visitation of the sick, extreme unction, and the ordinal. It originally opened the mass, as is shown by the Constitutions of Cluny and the Stowe Missal, the same usage prevailing at Milan. It is clear, in the light of all evidence, that the *Kyrie* which now follows the *Introit* in the ordinary of the mass is a remnant of the processional litany. The popularity of the litany resulted in the composition of many new ones, some of them in metrical form and occasionally deviating widely from the model and spirit of the Church. The public use of new litanies was consequently made conditional on ecclesiastical approbation, and the only litanies now officially sanctioned in the Roman Catholic Church are the Litany of the Saints (approved 1601), the Litany of Loreto (approved 1587), the Litany of the Most Holy Name of Jesus (approved 1862), and the Litany of the Sacred Heart (approved Apr. 2, 1899). The Litany of the Saints, in its present form, is the liturgical litany *par excellence*, and is used on such occasions as the conferring of major orders, the blessing of the font on Holy Saturday and Whitsun Eve, as well as on the Rogation Days and St. Mark's Day. The form adopted was fixed in 1596, with a few additions made in 1683 and 1847, and contains sixty-three invocations of saints with the response "pray for us." The Litany of Loreto is devoted to the Virgin and receives its name from the fact that for centuries it has been sung on Saturdays in the Holy House of Loreto. Each penitential recitation of it gives an indulgence of 300 days, and its repetition on five designated feasts of the Virgin confers a plenary indulgence. The Litany of the Most Holy Name of Jesus, which, according to the Roman Catholic view, originated in the fifteenth century, likewise gives an indulgence of 300 days. These three litanies are also used in liturgical services and processions, but are sung only in Latin. There are in addition a number of litanies with episcopal sanction, such as those for brotherhoods, which are recited in the vernacular at non-liturgical public devotions.

In the first period of the Wittenberg Reforma-

2. Churches of the Reformation.

tion processions and litanies were retained, although they were discarded by 1525. Four years later, however, a revised litany was restored in Evangelical worship by Luther himself, the immediate occasion being a threatened invasion of the Turks. He evidently published a separate German version of this litany, although no copy of this edition is known to be extant, but there is no ground for assuming that he issued the Latin text of it as he proposed to do. The German litany was also appended to the third edition of his smaller catechism, but was later omitted, although it then found its way into the hymnals, doubtless with its author's approval. The Latin version, in like manner, was almost certainly contained in the hymnal of Klug published in 1529 and no longer extant. It may well have included the German version as well, like the later editions of the work and a number of other hymnals of the same period. The extension of the litany through middle and north Germany by means of the hymn-books was rapid, but it was comparatively rarely found, on the other hand, in southern or southwestern German hymnody. There, however, it was spread by the church orders, the more important ones all containing it. The original Lutheran litany was closely similar to the Roman Catholic Litany of the Saints, except that all invocations of the saints, as well as petitions for the pope and the dead, were omitted. On the other hand, the petitions are more specialized and more concrete than in the older litany, which is, nevertheless, far the richer.

In the northern and central parts of Germany no uniformity whatever prevailed in the time of the recitation of the litany. Wednesday and Friday were, on the whole, the favorite days, although it might also be recited on Tuesday, Sunday festivals, and at vespers on Saturday. Local usage in many cases prescribed it for special days, while numerous church orders required it to be said occasionally, although no special day was designated. The place which the litany occupied in the North and Middle German liturgy likewise varied. It might be recited alone, either in the morning or the evening, after the lesson, epistle, or sermon, and before or during the communion. An equal lack of uniformity prevailed in southern and southwestern Germany, but there the litany, in harmony with the intention of Luther, retained its original character of a penitential prayer more than in the north, so that in Strasburg it followed the confession and absolution. The litany was subject, furthermore, to numerous local modifications, petitions being inserted or omitted practically at pleasure.

In Wittenberg the German litany was chanted by the choir-boys, while the congregation sang the responses, although ultimately one part of the choir chanted the petitions and the other responded. The Latin litany was sung only in the latter fashion. In the seventeenth century the Latin litany was discarded altogether, and in case there was a trained choir, the pastor, kneeling or standing with his face toward the altar, intoned the petition, while the congregation, led by the choir, sang the responses. If for any reason the litany was not sung, it might be recited or read. These modes of repeating the litany gradually supplanted the singing of it, but on the whole, though it is still retained in almost all modern German liturgies, it has lost its hold in great measure on the congregations because of its monotony.

The Reformed Church had little sympathy with the litany, and rejected it almost without exception, so that wherever Calvinism gained supremacy over Lutheranism, the litany was abolished.

The Moravians have two litanies, the "Church Litany" and the "Litany of the Life, Passion, and Death of Jesus Christ." The former is used in a double form, a shorter version having been made in 1873, while the latter is derived from the "Litany of Wounds" composed by Zinzendorf in 1744.

(P. Drews.)

The litany of the English Book of Common Prayer was originally intended to be a distinct office. A rubric in the first prayer-book (1549) ordered it to be said on Wednesdays and Fridays, before the communion-office. It was then placed after the communion-office, and in 1552 put in the place it now occupies, with the direction that it was to be "used upon Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and at other times when it shall be commanded by the ordinary." The clause in Edward's prayer-book, "From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities," was omitted in 1559.

Bibliography: On litanies in general consult: Bingham, *Origenes*, XIII., i. 10–12; E. Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus*, Antwerp, 1763; M. Gerbert, *Vitus liturgia Alemannica*, parts ii.–iii., San Blas, 1776; idem, *Monumenta veteris liturgiæ Alemannicæ*, part ii., ib. 1779; A. J. Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, iv. 1, pp. 555 sqq., Mainz, 1827; C. W. Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, x. 26 sqq., Leipsic, 1829; T. F. D. Kliefoth, *Liturgische Abhandlungen*, v. 301 sqq., 373 sqq., 398 sqq., vi. 152 sqq., 225 sqq., 298 sqq., viii. 66 sqq., 8 vols., Schwerin, 1858–69; J. M. Neale, *Essays on Liturgiology and Church History*, London, 1863; A. P. Stanley, *Christian Institutions*, chap. xii., New York, 1881; G. Rietschel, *Lehrbuch der Liturgik*, i. 200–201 et passim, Berlin, 1900; F. Spitta, in *Monatschrift für Gottesdienst und kirchliche Kunst*, vi (1901), 375 sqq.; L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, passim, London, 1904.

On the Lauretanian Litany consult: J. Sauren, *Die lauretanische Litanei*, Kempten, 1895; A. de Santi, *Le Litanei Lauretane*, Rome, 1897; J. Braun, in *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, lviii (1900), 418–437. On the litany of the Brethren cf. J. T. Müller, in *Monatschrift für Gottesdienst und kirchliche Kunst*, vii. 1902. On the Anglican Litany consult: J. H. Blunt, *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, London, 1903; J. N. McCormick, *The Litany and the Life*, Milwaukee, 1904; F. Procter and W. H. Frere, *New Hist. of the Book of Common Prayer*, London, 1905. No small part of the literature cited under Liturgy necessarily deals with the litany.

LITHUANIA. See Russia.

LITTLE, CHARLES EUGENE: Methodist Episcopalian; b. at Waterbury, Vt., Apr. 7, 1838. He was graduated in 1860 from the theological department of Boston University (then at Concord, N. H.), was ordained deacon (1862) and elder (1864), and has held pastorates at Dannemora, N. Y. (1860–61), Clintonville, N. Y. (1862–63), Fair Haven, Vt. (1865–67), Newmarket, N. J. (1867), Eighth Avenue Church, Newark, N. J. (1868–70), Hackettstown, N. J. (1871, 1875–77), Nyack, N. Y. (1873–74), Park Church, Elizabeth, N. J. (1878–80), Centenary Church, Newark, N. J. (1881–83), Calvary Church, East Orange, N. J. (1884–86), Grace Church, Port Richmond, Staten Island (1887–91), Lafayette Church, Jersey City, N. J. (1892–96), West Side Avenue Church, Jersey City (1897–1901), Arlington, N. J. (1902–05), Hackensack, N. J. (1905), and Verona, N. J., since 1905. He has written: *Biblical Lights and Side Lights* (New York, 1883); *Historical Lights* (1886); and *Cyclopedia of Classified Dates* (1900).

LITTLE SISTERS OF THE POOR, THE: A religious order of women which had its origin in Saint Servan, near the coast town of St. Malo in Brittany. In 1840 the village priest, M. le Pailleur, first interested Jeanne Jugan, a humble servant girl, and a few other pious women in the care of some of the aged poor people of the locality, and in 1842 a house was bought to serve as a refuge for the same. The work, though undertaken without any definite or far-reaching plan, and utterly without resources, save the alms contributed by a far from opulent surrounding population, developed with an unlooked-for rapidity. The spirit of poverty and the unselfish devotedness which characterized the founders of the work soon made them very popular, and in the course of a few years they were organized on the lines of a religious congregation which in twenty years spread to most of the cities of France, and even to Belgium and England. The object of the organization is the establishment and maintenance of permanent homes for the destitute aged and infirm of both sexes without distinction of creed or nationality. To be admitted to these homes the applicants must be " respectable," i.e., of good moral character, and, as a rule, they must be over sixty years of age. They are supported and cared for personally by the sisters who depend entirely on charity for their maintenance. The rule of the community, which is based on that of St. Augustine, received the solemn approbation of the Holy See July 9, 1854. The order was legally recognized by the French government in 1856, and it finds place among the few congregations which survived the legislation enacted against the religious communities in France in 1905 and 1906.

The order was introduced into the United States in 1868 when their first home was opened in Brooklyn, and in 1907 the American membership numbered 800 sisters with two provincial headquarters, one in Brooklyn and the other in Chicago. They conduct fifty homes for the aged in the various cities of the Union, chiefly in those of the East and Middle West, the total number of inmates being over 9,000. JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. P. Migne, *Encyclopédie théologique*, vol. xxiii.; *Dictionnaire des ordres religieux*, vol. iv (under " Petites Soeurs des Pauvres "), Paris, 1859; L. Aubineau, *Lebensbeschreibungen. Die kleinen Schwestern der Armen*, Regensburg, 1871; *Nouveau dictionnaire d'histoire et de geographie*, ib. 1874; G. Ratzinger, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Armenpflege*, pp. 518 sqq., Freiburg, 1884; *Official Catholic Directory for the United States*, Milwaukee, 1909; Baunard, *E. Lelièvre et les fondations des Petites Sœurs des pauvres*, Paris, 1904; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, ii. 388–389.

LITTLEDALE, RICHARD FREDERICK: Church of England; b. in Dublin Sept. 14, 1833; d. in London Jan. 11, 1890. He studied at Trinity College, Dublin (B.A., 1854; M.A., 1858; LL.D., 1862; D.C.L., Oxford, 1862). He was curate of Thorpe Hamlet, Norfolk (1856–57), then of St. Mary the Virgin, Soho, London (1857–61); but, being compelled by ill-health to abandon parochial work, he devoted himself to religious literature, and became a voluminous writer. As an opponent of the Church of Rome, he attracted much attention. Among his works may be mentioned: *Religious Communities of Women in the Early Church* (London, 1862); *Offices of the Holy Eastern Church* (1863); *The Mixed Chalice* (1863); *The North Side of the Altar* (1864); *Catholic Ritual in the Church of England* (1865); *The Elevation of the Host* (1865); *Early Christian Ritual* (1867); *Commentary on the Psalms* (in continuation of Dr. Neale's, vols. ii.–iv., 1868–74); *Commentary on the Song of Songs* (1869); *Religious Education of Women* (1872); *Papers on Sisterhoods* (1874–78); *Last Attempt to reform the Church of Rome from within* (1875); *Ultramontane Popular Literature* (1876); *An Inner View of the Vatican Council* (1877); *Plain Reasons against joining the Church of Rome* (1879); *A Short History of the Council of Trent* (1888); *The Petrine Claims: a Critical Inquiry* (1889). He contributed to the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (9th ed.); edited Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo?* (1863); and shared in editing *The Priests' Prayer-Book* (1864); *The People's Hymnal* (1867); *Liturgies of SS. Mark, James, Clement, Chrysostom, and Basil* (1868–69); *The Christian Passover* (1873); and *The Altar Manual* (1877).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *DNB*, xxxiii. 364–365; O. C. H. King, *The Character of Dr. Littledale as a Controversialist*, London, 1888. Further literature is indicated in Richardson, *Encyclopaedia*, p. 634.

LITTLEJOHN, ABRAM NEWKIRK: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Long Island; b. at Florida, N. Y., Dec. 13, 1824; d. at Williamstown, Mass., Aug. 3, 1901. He was educated at Union College (B.A., 1845) and at Princeton Theological Seminary. He was ordained deacon in 1848 and priest the following year. While deacon he officiated at Amsterdam, N. Y., and at Meriden, Conn. He was rector of Christ Church, Springfield, Mass. (1850–51); St. Paul's Church, New Haven, Conn. (1851–60); and Church of the Holy Trinity, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1860–69). During his rectorate in New Haven he was professor of pastoral theology in the Berkeley Divinity School at Middletown, Conn. He was consecrated as the first bishop of the new diocese of Long Island (Jan. 27, 1869), having previously been elected bishop of Central New York, but declined the position. He had oversight of the American Protestant Episcopal churches on the Continent (1874–86). His principal works are: *Conciones ad Clerum* (New York, 1881); *Individualism: its Growth and Tendencies* (1881; lectures before the University of Cambridge) and *The Christian Ministry at the close of the 19th Century* (1884; lectures on the Bishop Paddock foundation, General Theological Seminary, New York).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 195, New York, 1895.

LITURGICS.*

I. Fundamental Principles.
  Importance and Delimitation of Liturgy (§ 1).
  Theory of Liturgy (§ 2).
  Relation of Liturgy to Doctrine (§ 3).
  Exemplification by the Lutheran Liturgy (§ 4).
  Christian Use of the Term (§ 5).
II. Historical Development.
  Service in Temple and Synagogue (§ 1).
  Development of the Christian Service (§ 2).
  Medieval Elaborations (§ 3).
  After the Reformation (§ 4).
III. Liturgical Formulas.
  Amen (§ 1).
  The Doxologies (§ 2).
  Alleluia (§ 3).
  Hosanna (§ 4).
  Kyrie Eleison (§ 5).
  Pax vobiscum, Dominus vobiscum (§ 6).

I. Fundamental Principles:

1. Importance and Delimitation of Liturgy.

Proclamation of the Gospel, prayer, and the administration of the Sacraments belong to the essence of the Church and of public worship as well. If the body of Christ is to be truly edified, the officiating ministers and every member of the congregation must be quickened continually by the Spirit of God. The precise manner, however, in which the principal elements of divine service are combined into a harmonious whole is of less vital importance. Nevertheless, side by side with ecclesiastical wisdom and orthodox belief, a certain sense of the value of constant types and modes of confessional expression is a factor of moment, which, in its turn, reflects a common need that finds its support in the force of historic tradition. Thus arises the liturgy, or the form of worship in ecclesiastical communities. In a restrictive sense, the idea denotes the composite aggregate of the permanent elements of worship outside the sermon; that is, the parts which, in harmony with the principles of religious logic, are comprised in the official Church manual, or liturgy proper. By an extension of the liturgical idea, the entire order of public worship, including the sermon, is thus designated. In the latter case, however, only the relative position of the sermon, and not its content, is considered, the theme and style of the sermon being independent of fixed definition (see Homiletics; Preaching). Equally outside the realm of liturgics is the fact that the communion is celebrated according to Christ's institution; but the questions as to whether the words of institution shall be recited, whether a formula of distribution shall be employed, and whether an altar or a table shall be used, are distinctly liturgic. Indeed, it was only through the liturgy that the consecration itself became an integral element of the divine service. At the same time, in virtue of its peculiar solemnity, the Lord's Supper (q.v.; see also Eucharist; Mass) became the central point of liturgic arrangement, so that the term " liturgy " found its principal application in connection with the celebration of the Eucharist.

2. Theory of Liturgy.

The result of a liturgy was reached neither by divine revelation nor by canonical enactment. The worship of the early Church reveals an exuberance of spiritual life and a great diversity of spiritual gifts, but in so amorphous a state that Paul found himself obliged to urge uniformity in worship (I Cor. xiv.). Though Paul by no means established a working principle for the regulation of public worship, the liturgical tendency was inherent in the factor of historic conservatism which began to exert itself from the very first, as is shown, for instance, by the custom, derived from the synagogue custom (see below, II., § 1), of congregational response to the prayers of thanksgiving. The tendency to create some permanent order, the significance of which should reach beyond the local and transient, implanted itself with formative and regulative power in the administrative organism of the spiritual life. Nevertheless, this process never gained the character of a law; nor were liturgical elaborations so abstract that spontaneously personal elements could not find a place in the official prayers. It is obvious that the composers of particular liturgical forms must remain in the background. But notwithstanding all this, each liturgy is characteristic of the ecclesiastical community to which it appertains; nor must it be forgotten that the phraseology of the sermon has a decided influence upon liturgical expression. Moreover, this festal robe of ceremonial practise, woven by custom, receives its interwoven warp and woof of symbolism and artistic ornament. This is not to be adjudged worldly or unevangelical; since here, too, is discerned rather a vital impulse, proceeding from the divine cosmic dispensation and influencing advantageously the domain of spiritual benefits. The same tendency, in a narrower sense, has given artistic adornment to such liturgical objects as the altar, the pulpit, and the sacred vessels, and has employed special colors in a symbolic scheme to emphasize the proper nature of the festival seasons (see Paramenta; Symbolism). A redundancy of these subsidiary devices, to the repression of what is essential to worship, is, however, reprehensible. The Reformation rightly returned to simplicity in this respect, the Reformed Church more decidedly than the German, though even Luther, for all his unrestrained appreciation of the artistic and symbolic, contrived to observe the requisite bounds. See Worship.

3. Relation of Liturgy to Doctrine.

In considering the relation between the liturgy of the Church and its doctrine, it is clear that modifications of doctrine can not remain without influence upon the liturgy, as is attested by the history of worship at every turn. The more the comprehension of the salvation wrought by the death of Christ recedes into the background, the shallower becomes the substance of the Eucharistic prayers. The more strictly the Reformation returned to the Scriptures and to Christ's purpose in the institution of the Eucharist, the more distinctly was this reflected in the revision of Evangelical liturgies. On the other hand, if the true character of an ecclesiastical community is to be truly known, liturgy as well as doctrine must be considered. It may be laid down as a general principle that the closer the adherence to the simple sense of the Scriptures, the fewer will be the liturgical elaborations in question. The question as to what is essential to a liturgy is not abstract, but should be answered with reverent regard for historic and conservative forms. For even if historic usage were abandoned and a course of absolute innovation were adopted, nevertheless, the new forms thus created would themselves exhibit a marked tendency to resist subsequent innovations.

---

* This article should be read in connection with the articles Mass (for the Roman Catholic development), Agenda, Eucharist, and Lord's Supper (for the Protestant side).

The present status of the Lutheran liturgy shows evidence of the influence of the principles of conservative reform. In some respects there has been a reaction as regards Luther's alterations in the *Deutsche Messe,* in favor of still older forms. To the introit of the Mass there corresponds in the Evangelical order of worship, after the opening hymn, an antiphon in Scriptural phraseology adapted especially from the Old Testament. In this the distinctive character of the feast or the church season concerned must be reflected from the very first. The *Confiteor,* instead of remaining a priestly act of preparation, became a congregational confession of sin—again a return to the pre-Lutheran liturgy. The *Kyrie* and *Gloria* following the *Confiteor* were incorporated in the Lutheran liturgy. The salutation *Dominus vobiscum,* together with the response *Et cum spiritu tuo,* both omitted by Luther, were very early restored in the Evangelical liturgies. The reading of Scripture has no longer for its mission the familiarization of the congregation with the Bible, but is designed solemnly to remind them of this treasure, with the accompaniment of responses which may be freely supplemented on occasion. The "voice of Scripture" is followed by the "voice of the Church," the recitation of the Apostles' Creed for which, however, a hymn of like purport, such as Luther's *Wir glauben all an einen Gott,* may be substituted. In the communion service, Luther still spared the ancient Preface, and also accepted the *Agnus Dei.* But even in this domain, a refined liturgical sense decided largely in favor of earlier ecclesiastical usage. For instance, the Lord's Prayer was reinstated in its rightful place, before the *Pax* and the distribution, while the form of distribution was again duly honored. In every direction there was careful insistence upon historic connection, in harmony with Protestant tenets.

4. Exemplification by the Lutheran Liturgy.

With reference to the application of the term "liturgy" to the sphere of divine service, the Christian use of the word is based on the Septuagint, which translates the Hebrew *'aboda,* in relation to the Temple service, by *leitourgia.* In the New Testament, however, the word does not occur in connection with ceremonial affairs, but indicates the service which the Christian renders to God in faith and obedience, as in Heb. viii. 2, 6; Phil. ii. 17; Rom. xv. 16; or with reference to brotherly support, as in Rom. xv. 27; Phil. ii. 25, 30; II Cor. ix. 12. The relation to ceremonial practises recurs most closely in Acts xiii. 2; though here, too, the idea of ceremonially regulated usage is to be rejected. The ecclesiastical use of the term reverts principally to the Old Testament, significantly implying a transfer of pre-Christian legalism to the Christian dispensation. Hence the current expressions for Levitical and priestly acts were applied to divine worship, especially in order to designate the central and sacrificial act. Moreover, *leitourgia* and *leitourgein* were once more employed in the ceremonial sense. The Western Church early borrowed the term to designate the Eucharist. The Evangelical confessions gave preference to the term *cœrimonia;* and it was only under the influence of Humanism (q.v.), beginning with the sixteenth century, that the word *liturgia* came into current use, first among the Roman Catholics, and later among the Protestants. The term is now often used in a widened sense, and the phrases baptismal, marriage, confirmation, and burial liturgies are loosely employed. For the history of Lutheran liturgics see AGENDA.

5. Christian Use of the Term.

HERMANN HERING.

II. Historical Development: The first Christians, being members of the Jewish Church, followed naturally the Jewish manner of worship. The services to which they were accustomed were those of the Temple (q.v.) and of the Synagogue (q.v.). The temple service was elaborate, and was for the purpose of worship; the synagogue service was simple and was for the purpose of instruction. The temple contributed to liturgical development the tradition of a noble service, in a stately building, with vested clergy, with prayers accompanied by the symbol of Incense (q.v.), with praises sung from the book of psalms, with an altar, and with the varied interest and significance of an ordered sequence of feasts and fasts. The fact, however, that the temple was in Jerusalem, and that it was destroyed and its services ended forever in 70 A.D., gave its liturgical precedents a minor part in the making of the primitive Christian devotions. These were patterned mainly upon those of the synagogue. The synagogue was a plain building, having a platform at the further end. On the platform were seats for church officials, and in the midst was a pulpit. Over the pulpit hung an ever-burning lamp, and back of the pulpit, behind a curtain against the wall, was a chest containing the rolls of the sacred books. The ordinary service began with the *Shema,* a habitual, daily devotion, like the Lord's Prayer, consisting of three passages of Scripture, Deut. vi. 4–9, xi. 13–21; Num. xv. 37–41. After this came the *Shemoneh esreh,* or eighteen benedictions, each with a recurring phrase or refrain, followed by an Amen as a congregational response. This was succeeded by the first lesson, taken from the Law, read in seven parts by seven readers, each pronouncing a few verses, the verses being translated into Aramaic, with explanation, comment, and application. The second lesson was a single reading from the Prophets, translated and explained as before (cf. Luke iv. 16 sqq.). With a collection for the poor, and a benediction, perhaps with some singing of psalms, the service ended.

1. Service in Temple and Synagogue.

To this service the Christians added a Liturgy of Christ in the Holy Communion; and a Liturgy of the Holy Ghost in the short-lived enthusiasm of the speaking with tongues, and a Liturgy of God the Father in the agapē, or love-feast, which assembled the faithful as the family of God to the enjoyment of his blessings. (See AGAPE; EUCHARIST; LORD'S SUPPER).

2. Development of the Christian Service.

The synagogue service grew into the homiletical introduction to the Holy Communion, called the Missa Catechumenorum, with the reading of passages from the Epistles and the Gospels, followed by a sermon. It affected also the daily prayers. These daily devotions, which came to be called the Divine Office, had their beginning in the observance of hours of prayer. Two such hours were suggested by the natural instincts of the religious life: the morning, at cock-crowing, called matins; the evening, at candle-lighting, called vespers. These were at first observed in private or as times for family worship; but presently they were kept in the consecrated quiet of the church, people coming in at these seasons and saying their prayers, each person by himself. Gradually, other seasons of devotion began to be observed. First, the vigil, which in its original form was a night of prayer before Easter, and then came to precede ordinary Sundays, and then to be a time of spiritual preparation for saints' days. On these occasions the morning prayer was in two parts, one in the night, called matins or nocturns; the other at dawn, called lauds. Then, to meet the eagerness for the privilege of prayer, three hours were kept in the day: the third hour, nine o'clock, called terce, remembering the disciples on the Day of Pentecost; the sixth hour, twelve o'clock, called sext, remembering St. Peter on the housetop; the ninth hour, called none, remembering how Peter and John went into the temple at the hour of prayer. Thus there were six times for daily prayer: matins, lauds, terce, sext, none, and vespers. The next step was to make these individual devotions public and congregational, and to have them led by the clergy. Of course, for busy people, such a continual exercise of prayer was impossible. For them, as is common to-day, the daily devotions were for the most part the private prayers which they said at the cock-crow and at the candle-lighting. The faithful who went to church six times a day were mainly ascetics, whose chief interest and occupation in life was the act of prayer. Presently, these devout persons were gathered into groups and societies, and disappeared from sight in monasteries. There they added to the six daily services two more: Prime, as the prayers before the daily chapter meeting, and Compline, before going to bed. Thus the cycle was completed. It had never had much place in the experience of the ordinary layman. It was understood to be intended for the clergy and for the members of religious orders.

The heart of the daily services was the book of psalms. To recite or sing these psalms was the purpose for which the faithful met at the appointed hours. The psalter was arranged to be gone over in a week. To the psalms were added Scripture readings, and a few prayers, with versicles and responses. The Latin Church introduced hymns in meter, and lengthened lauds and vespers with commemorations of the saints.

3. Medieval Elaborations.

And the saints, in rapidly increasing numbers, claimed their rights in the services, having lessons and prayers appropriate to their virtues. And the Little Office of the Virgin paralleled all the eight services with an order of its own. These enrichments came to their fulness in the thirteenth century. They made it necessary to use a great number of books in the conduct of the service: the psalter, the antiphonal, the hymnal, the Bible, the collect book, the processional; and for direction, the consuetudinary, the ordinal, and the directorium. With the rise of the Franciscans in the thirteenth century, and the free movement of persons committed to the life of religion, it became necessary to bring this liturgical library into some condensed, compact and portable form, and the Breviary (q.v.) was the result. The order for the Holy Communion had been similarly enriched and was correspondingly simplified in the Missal (see MASS).

4. After the Reformation.

As the era of the Protestant Reformation came on, the need of further liturgical revision was felt by many, and steps in that direction were taken both with and without ecclesiastical authority. Thus in 1535, Cardinal Quignon at the request of Pope Clement VII. undertook are vision of the breviary. Clement died before the completion of this work, and it was dedicated to Pope Paul III., who formally permitted the secular clergy to substitute it for the breviary unreformed. Quignon altered some things and some he added; he removed some legends from the lectionary; he arranged to have the Bible read at length and not, as had come to be the usage, in detached fragments; he arranged the psalter so as to be read in course and not interrupted by substituting special psalms. Also he took out two-thirds of the saints' days and all the offices of the Virgin, and omitted a great number of versicles, responses, invitationes, and antiphons. In a second edition, however, he restored the antiphons by request of the theological faculty of Paris. This was the authorized breviary of the Western Church until it was superseded in 1568 by the present book, made by a commission of the Council of Trent. In 1543, Archbishop Herman of Cologne (see HERMAN OF WIED) published a directory of public worship, in sympathy with the Reformation. This was composed at his request by Butzer and Melanchthon, on the basis of a form compiled by Luther, called the Nuremberg Liturgy. The book contained forms of prayer and a litany, with directions for the administration of the sacraments, and for other services, with many explanations. One of its characteristic features was the addressing of exhortations to the people. This book was disallowed by the Church, and the archbishop was expelled. These two liturgical revisions were in the hands of Archbishop Cranmer during the preparation of the English Book of Common Prayer, and he made great use of both. For the history of this work see COMMON PRAYER, BOOK OF.

Meanwhile, both in England and on the Continent the conditions of ecclesiastical strife were inducing among many a liturgical reaction. The Lutheran Church, indeed, held to many of the traditions of devotion, but the Calvinistic churches of Switzerland and France, and the Puritan churches of England and Scotland, abandoned the old forms and adopted for the most part an extemporaneous worship. This was an incident in a bitter contention, and proceeded not so much from a dislike of the ancient prayers as from a dislike of the people who insisted on them. This dislike the course of time has mitigated, and at present there is a general return in most of the Protestant churches to the liturgical treasures which the fathers left behind.

George Hodges.

III. Liturgical Formulas: Under this head it is convenient to group together several traditional phrases frequently used in divine worship, and appearing again and again in the most various liturgies.

1. Amen.

The Hebrew *amen,* when used adverbially in the Scriptures (e.g., Num. v. 22; Deut. xxvii. 15; Ps. xli. 13), has the force of strong affirmation or assent, usually to the words spoken by another, although it may also be used as a preliminary affirmation of the speaker's own, occurring frequently in this sense in the words of Jesus. Its liturgical use is the former. It is thus found in the Jewish rites, as an assent by the congregation to the content of a prayer. The Christian Church borrowed this usage, keeping the Hebrew form, the meaning of which was always familiar to theologians, though perhaps not always to the people at large, for whom a translation was sometimes appended, as in the Coptic liturgies. Its primitive use as conveying the assent of the whole congregation to the prayer of any member (cf. I Cor. xiv. 16) remained when the utterance of the prayer became the office of a distinct clerical class, as is shown by nearly all the Eastern liturgies. An exceptional case is the liturgy contained in the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions, where the "Amen" is assigned to the congregation after three prayers only—the Trisagion (q. v.), the prayer of intercession, and the formula of administration. In the modern Greek Church, the "Amen" is taken from the congregation and given to the choir—and then in comparatively few places. In some Eastern baptismal rites, as still among the Nestorians, it seems to have been customary for the congregation to say Amen after each part of the baptismal formula; in the present Eastern Church it is thus pronounced by the priest, having lost its original meaning and become a mere concluding word. The most obvious retention of the old usage in the West occurs in the Mozarabic Liturgy (q.v.), where some of the responses are indeed assigned to the choir, but the congregation is bidden to answer in other cases, especially with "Amen." In the present Roman rite, the "Amen" belongs either to the assistants or to the choir, or is pronounced by the priest himself, as in the formula of administration at communion and at the end of the Lord's Prayer in the mass. Luther interpreted the "Amen" in the sense of his own doctrine of faith, as "an expression of firm and hearty belief," and the Reformation restored the use of it in a number of cases, though not in all, to the congregation. In the Anglican Book of Common Prayer it occurs at the end of every prayer as the response of the people, except after the first Lord's Prayer in the Communion Office.

2. The Doxologies.

In continuation of the old synagogal custom, the primitive Christians closed every important liturgical prayer with a doxology, and the custom was extended to sermons also. The simplest form was "to thee (or "to whom") be glory throughout all ages" (cf. Rom. xi. 36; Phil. iv. 20; Didache ix. 2, 3; Apostolic Constitutions II., xxii. 11). A number of formulas grew up in the course of time, differing according to the influence of the dogma of the Trinity. While from the second to the beginning of the fourth century the form "to thee be glory in the Holy Ghost through Jesus Christ" was usual, when it became possible to suspect Arianism in such a phrase, it was changed to one which completely coordinated the three Persons, "Glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost." The *Gloria Patri,* known as the lesser doxology to distinguish it from the *Gloria in excelsis,* was slow to find its way into all the Eastern liturgies. Thus it is not found in the Clementine liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions or in that of St. James, and even the ninth-century liturgies of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil do not contain it. It is of frequent occurrence, on the other hand, in the Nestorian and Armenian liturgies and in the present liturgy of St. Chrysostom, as well as less often in the various Jacobite rites. The second half, "As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen," does not occur in the East, and is probably of Roman origin. The Synod of Vaison (529) asserts that its use was universal in Italy and Africa, and directs its introduction into Gaul. It is not in the Mozarabic liturgy, where the formula runs "Glory and honor to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost throughout all ages." In the Eastern rites the doxology was used in many different places. The Roman liturgy, on the other hand, lays down fixed rules for its use. It occurs regularly at the end of each psalm, and the first half of it in the responsories of the day and night hours; in the Mass it occurs in the preparation, after the Introit or anthem sung at the beginning of the communion service in the Roman Catholic Church, and after the *Lavabo* psalm. The custom of using it thus at the end of psalms or parts of psalms is first attested by John Cassian (before 426), and next by Pope Vigilius (d. 555). The assertion of medieval liturgiologists that the practise was introduced by Pope Damasus is possibly true. As the *Gloria Patri* has a more or less festival or triumphant character, it is wholly or partly omitted on occasions of mourning, as in Holy Week and in services for the dead; in the latter case the Greeks still use it. Luther seems to have ignored the *Gloria Patri,* although modern Lutheran liturgies put it after the introit. The *Gloria in ex-*

celsis, or Greater Doxology, by an unknown author, occurs in the Eastern liturgies, which vary in the position assigned to it, and also forms the opening of a service for morning prayer found in the Apostolic Constitutions (VII., xlvii.), the pseudo-Athanasian *De virginitate*, and the Codex Alexandrinus. The Latin version used in the Mass, said to have been made by Hilary of Poitiers, is slightly altered from the original. According to the *Liber pontificalis*, Pope Telesphorus (q.v.) prescribed the use of the angelic hymn as found in Luke ii. 14 for the Christmas service, and Pope Symmachus (q.v.) of the expanded form for all Sundays and feasts of martyrs. It was then to be used only by bishops; priests might recite it only at Easter and in their first Eucharist. At the end of the eleventh century its use was permitted to priests at all times when it was liturgically prescribed. By the present Roman use, it is omitted on all days not of a festal character. Luther retained it in his *Formula missæ*, but does not mention it in his *Deutsche Messe*, though this may be because it was taken by many as going with the *Kyrie*. Most of the Lutheran service-books retained it, and so did the Reformed; Zwingli provided that it should be intoned by the minister in German, and then taken up by the men and women of the congregation alternately. In the Anglican Book of Common Prayer it was removed from the beginning to the end of the communion service; and in the American it was also permitted to be used as an alternative to the *Gloria Patri* after the psalms.

3. Alleluia.

The Hebrew formula *halleluyah*, " praise ye Yahweh," which was frequently used in Jewish worship, passed over untranslated into the Christian services. The earliest indication of this use is Rev. xix. 1–8. In the earliest definitely liturgical use it occurred after the reading of the epistle and at the time of communion. In the Eastern Church it is still used even in penitential seasons and in services for the dead. For the West the earliest evidence is Tertullian, *De oratione*, xxvii. Here, with the stronger emphasis laid on ecclesiastical seasons, it is not surprising that in the African Church it became customary to omit it in Lent (Augustine, *Enarratio in Psalmos cx. cxlviii.*), while another passage of Augustine (*Epist. ad Januarium*, lv.) implies that in his day it was regularly sung between Easter and Pentecost, and occasionally at other times. According to Sozomen (*Hist. eccl.*, VII., xix.), it was sung at Rome only on Easter-day, and this statement is accepted by Cassiodorus (c. 570) and supported by a mention of Vigilantius (c. 400) in Jerome (*Contra Vigilantium*, i.), although Johannes Diaconus, in the fifth century, speaks of its being used at Rome during the whole paschal season. According to the most probable interpretation of a passage in Gregory the Great's letters (*MPL*, lxxvii. 956), it would seem that in the pontificate of Damasus (366–384) the eastern custom of singing Alleluia throughout the year found footing in Rome, and that in the fifth century it began to be restricted to the paschal season, while Gregory permitted a wider use. This may be reconciled with the statement of Sozomen by supposing that he referred to a special anthem containing the word " Alleluia," and not to the word itself. According to present Roman usage, the word is omitted altogether from Septuagesima to Easter, being replaced at the beginning of the choir offices by " Praise to thee, O Lord, King of eternal glory." In the paschal season, on the other hand, it is frequently used, being appended to antiphons, versicles and responses, and to the gradual and offertory in the Mass. Luther retained it in the *Formula missæ* with the gradual, and in the later Lutheran services it is usually placed after the epistle, except in Passion-tide—although Luther prescribed it even here.

4. Hosanna.

Hosanna as a word of praise occurs in the ancient liturgies only in the anthem known as *Benedictus* (Matt. xxi. 9); and here it is absent from all the liturgies belonging to the Egyptian type and from many of the Syrian class; it was unknown at Antioch in Chrysostom's time, at Jerusalem in Cyril's, and in the Byzantine liturgies of the fifth to the eighth centuries as reconstructed by Brightman. It is found, on the other hand, in the *Didache* (x. 6) and correspondingly in the Apostolic Constitutions (VII., xxvi. 1; also VIII., xiii. 3); in the Byzantine liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom; in the liturgy of St. James; in the Armenian and Nestorian liturgies, and in the ninth-century Byzantine. Except in the two first-named sources, it occurs uniformly after the Trisagion or *Sanctus*. There is reason to believe, however, that this is a later innovation, and that the primitive usage is preserved in the Clementine liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions, where it occurs immediately before the administration, following the proclamation " Holy things to holy persons." It is even possible that just as the Jews sang Ps. cxviii. 25 sqq. after the Passover meal, so the Christian *Benedictus* was originally sung at the conclusion of the whole service; and this theory is supported by the fact that in the Armenian liturgy and that of the Coptic Jacobites the phrase " Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord " is placed after the communion of the people. In the West the *Benedictus* is found in all the most various types of liturgical production, almost without exception in connection with the *Sanctus*. The only noteworthy variant phenomenon is that in the Gallican liturgy it seems not to have been sung by the choir, as the *Sanctus* was, but to have more often formed the beginning of a *collectio post Sanctus* recited by the priest—or perhaps, having been already sung, it was repeated by him to connect the prayer with what had gone before. Luther retained both *Sanctus* and *Benedictus* in his *Formula missæ*, but placed them after the words of institution; in the *Deutsche Messe* he does not mention the *Benedictus*. In the later Lutheran service-books the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus* usually follow the preface. The Anglican Prayer-Book retains the *Sanctus* but omits the *Benedictus;* it is very frequently, however, at the present time, sung immediately before the consecration, as is the *Agnus Dei* after.

The prayer " Lord have mercy upon me " or " us " (Gk., *Kyrie eleēson me* or *hēmas*) occurs a

5. Kyrie Eleison.

number of times in the Old and New Testaments, and probably formed a recognized part of the Jewish ritual, from which it passed over into the Christian. The way in which it is mentioned by the authorities for the second half of the fourth century—the Apostolic Constitutions (VIII., vi. 1, 2, viii. 3), Chrysostom, and the *Peregrinatio Silviæ* (ed. Gamurrini p. 78, Rome, 1888)—implies old-established and wide-spread use. Prayers in the form of litanies seem to have grown up, in which this response was made by the people to the deacon; they were frequently of an intercessory character. The use of the *Kyrie eleison* as an independent prayer seems to have been later. In this way it is used twelve times in the liturgy of St. James, and three times in that of St. Mark and the Alexandrian liturgy of St. Basil, before the act of communion; it also occurs in the preparation and the dismissal, and was used sometimes in solemn processions. The Greek form is preserved throughout in the Coptic, Abyssinian, and Syriac liturgies. As for Western usage, it may be inferred from the *Peregrinatio Silviæ* that the Latin form *Miserere Domine* but not the Greek was familiar to her Gallic fellow countrymen. The same inference may be drawn from the next oldest witness, also Gallic, the second Synod of Vaison (529), which prescribes the "more frequent use" of the *Kyrie eleison* at mass and morning and evening prayers. It was familiar to the Gallic monks, as is shown by the *Regula ad monachos* of Bishop Aurelian of Arles (d. 550), where it appears as an independent prayer, sung three times, so also in the rule of St. Benedict. This development on different lines from the East is shown again by a passage in Gregory the Great's letters (IX., xii), from which the conclusions follow that the Latins, unlike the Greeks, had by this time the response *Christe eleison;* and that Gregory was thinking not of the response to the deacon's bidding-prayer, but of an independent formula repeated a definite number of times. This number is first positively fixed by a ninth-century *ordo* published by L. Duchesne (*Origines du culte chrétien,* p. 442, Paris, 1889), in which it is directed to be sung nine times, three for each invocation, as it is to-day in the Roman mass. Before the discovery of this *ordo,* Honorius of Autun (d. 1120) was the oldest witness known for the ninefold *Kyrie.* In the Milanese liturgy the *Kyrie* appears after the *Gloria in excelsis,* after the Gospel, and at the end, three times in each place. In the Mozarabic liturgy it occurs only in one mass, where it is probably due to Roman influence. In a word, the general use of the prayer probably grew up in Rome and spread thence throughout the West. In the Eastern form of a response to the deacon it occurs in the African liturgy, in the Celtic as exhibited in the Stowe Missal, and in a Lenten litany at Milan. Luther retained the *Kyrie eleison* nine times in the *Formula missæ,* but only three times in the *Deutsche Messe;* and thus it remains (in either German, Latin, or Greek) in nearly all Lutheran service-books. The Reformed liturgies dropped it altogether, and the Anglican ritual, while retaining it in the Litany, the Visitation of the Sick, and the Churching of Women (omitted in the latter place by the American book), substituted in a corresponding position the recitation of the Commandments with the response after each "Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law." In the American ritual, however, the *Kyrie* is to be said if the summary of the Decalogue (Matt. xxii. 37–40) is substituted in the Ante-Communion for the Decalogue itself.

6. Pax vobiscum, Dominus vobiscum.

The Jewish form of salutation "Peace be unto you," used by the risen Christ to his disciples (John xx. 19, 21, 26), passed into liturgical usage as the greeting of the bishop to the congregation at the beginning of public worship. In the form *eirēnē pasin,* "peace be to all," it is found in nearly all Eastern liturgies, usually with the response "And to thy spirit." The formula was frequently used at the beginning of a new division of the service; thus it occurs ten times in the liturgy of St. Mark. In the West *Pax vobis* or *vobiscum* is attested by Augustine, Optatus of Mileve, and Ambrose, but it was gradually replaced by *Dominus vobiscum* (derived from II Thess. iii. 16), probably originating at Rome, and originally used in the introduction to the Preface, where it appears in the *Canones Hippolyti* (in Greek), in the Gelasian and Gregorian sacramentaries, and in the first *Ordo Romanus,* as well as in the oldest Milanese liturgy. It is likewise found in the Ethiopic and Egyptian liturgies, and, in an extended form, in the Mozarabic, but does not occur in the Syrian or Byzantine rites. In the Roman Mass of to-day the old custom of the kiss of peace, though preserved only in a symbolic form, is accompanied by the phrase "the peace of the Lord be always with you," with the response "And with thy spirit." The *Dominus vobiscum* is used regularly before collects, both in the mass and in the choir offices; when the latter are recited by laymen without a priest, the versicle and response "O Lord, hear my prayer" "And let my cry come unto thee" are substituted; just as in the early Middle Ages a distinction was made between *Pax vobiscum* as the episcopal and *Dominus vobiscum* as the priestly salutation.

In the *Formula missæ* Luther retained the *Pax vobiscum* and the response before the Preface, but not after the *Gloria,* while in the *Deutsche Messe* he ignored it entirely. The majority of Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century, like Zwingli, on the other hand, retained it after the *Gloria,* but not before the communion. Modern Lutheran liturgies likewise place it after the *Gloria* before the collect. In the Anglican Prayer-Book the *Dominus vobiscum* and its response are placed after the Creed in morning and evening prayer, and it is also used in confirmation. (P. Drews.)

Bibliography: I.-II.: Much literature that is pertinent will be found cited under Breviary; Common Prayer, Book of; Eucharist; Litany; Lord's Supper; Mass; and Worship. A vast body of sources and discussions is indicated in the three sections of the *British Museum Catalogue* devoted to liturgies, the entries being admirably arranged for consultation under convenient captions, making reference easy. The following list comprises principally later works. Lists of Mss. are: W. H. J. Weale, *Bibliographica liturgica catalogus missalium ritus Latini,* London,

1886; H. Ehrensberger, *Bibliotheca liturgica*, Carlsruhe, 1889; *Bibliotheca musico—liturgica*, London, 1894 (a list of musical and Latin liturgical manuscripts of the Middle Ages).

Among the sources may be named: James Brogden, *Illustrations of the Liturgy and Ritual of the United Church of England and Ireland during the Seventeenth Century*, London, 1842; W. Palmer, *Origines Liturgicæ; or, Antiquities of the English Ritual*, 2 vols., ib. 1845; P. Hall, *Fragmenta Liturgica, Documents Illustrative of the Liturgy of the Church of England*, 7 vols., Bath, 1848; W. Trollope, *The Greek Liturgy of St. James, Edited with an English Introduction and Notes; together with a Latin Version of the Syriac Copy, and the Greek Text restored to its original Purity and accompanied by a literal English Translation*, 8 vols., Edinburgh, 1848; *The Eastern Liturgy of the Holy Catholic, Apostolic, simplified and supplemented by James Ferretti of Damascus*, London, 1866; *The Book of Common Order of the Church of Scotland, commonly Known as John Knox's Liturgy and the Directory for the Public Worship of God Agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster; Notes by G. W. Sprott and T. Leishman*, Edinburgh, 1868; S. C. Malan, *Divine Liturgy of the Armenian Church of St. Gregory*, London, 1870; F. E. Warren, *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, 8 vols., New York, 1882; J. M. Neale, *The Liturgies of St. Mark, St. James, St. Clement, St. Chrysostom, St. Basil and the Church of Malabar; translated with Introduction and Appendices*, London, 1883; C. A. Swainson, *The Greek Liturgies, chiefly from Original Authorities. With an Appendix containing the Coptic Ordinary Canon of the Mass from two Manuscripts in the British Museum*, ed. and transl., Dr. C. Bezold, ib. 1884; *The Divine and Sacred Liturgies of John Chrysostom and Basil the Great, with an Eng. transl.*, ed. J. N. W. B. Robertson, ib. 1886; A. Maltsev, *Die göttlichen Liturgien Johannes Chrysostomos, Basilios des Grossen und Gregorios Dialogos*, Berlin, 1890; idem, *Die Liturgien der orthodox-katholischen Kirche des Morgenlandes*, Berlin, 1894; H. A. Wilson, *The Galasian Sacramentary, Liber sacramentorum Romanæ ecclesiæ, ed. with Introduction, critical Notes, and Appendix with two Facsimiles*, New York, 1894; C. E. Hammond, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford, 1896; F. E. Warren, *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church*, London, 1897; F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, *Monumenta ecclesiae liturgica*, Paris, 1900; E. C. N. Barfoed, *Oldkirkens Liturgier*, Copenhagen, 1902; *Benedictional of Archbishop Robert of Rouen*, ed. H. A. Wilson in *Publications of the Henry Bradshaw Society*, vol. xxiv., London, 1903; V. Staley, *Hierurgia Anglicana; Documents and Extracts illustrative of the Ceremonial of the Anglican Church after the Reformation, edited by Members of the Ecclesiastical Society*, ib. 1903; *Die nestorianische Taufliturgie ins Deutsche übersetzt von G. Diettrich*, Giessen, 1903; A. Baumstark, *Liturgia Romana e liturgia dell'Esarcato. Il rito detto Patriarchino e le origini del Canon Missæ Romano*, Rome, 1904; A. Schoenfelder, *Liturgische Bibliothek; Sammlung gottesdienstlicher Bücher aus dem deutschen Mittelalter*, Paderborn, 1904; C. Wordsworth and H. Littlehales, *Old Service Books of the English Church*, London, 1904; *The East Syrian or Nestorian Rite, transl. by A. J. Maclean*, ib. 1905; *Ordo Romanus primus, with Introduction by E. G. C. F. Atchley*, ib. 1905; *Rituale Armenorum, the Administration of the Sacraments and the Breviary Rites of the Armenian Church*, edited by F. C. Conybeare, Oxford, 1905; *The Divine Liturgy of the Holy Apostolic Church of Armenia, Translated by two Armenian Priests*, London, 1908; D. Levi, *The Form of Prayers for the New Year, Day of Atonement, Feast of the Tabernacles, etc., according to the Custom of the German and the Polish Jews as read in their Synagogues and used in their Families. Carefully revised by I. Levi*, 6 vols., London, n.d.

Discussions of the subject are: F. Ehrenfeuchter, *Theorie des christlichen Cultus*, Hamburg, 1840; T. Kliefoth, *Theorie des Cultus der evangelischen Kirche*, Ludwigslust, 1844; idem, *Liturgische Abhandlungen*, 8 vols., Schwerin, 1854–62; C. W. Baird, *Eutaxia, or, The Presbyterian Liturgies: Historical Sketches*, New York, 1855, reprinted under the title, *A Chapter on Liturgies: Historical Sketches, with an introductory Preface and an Appendix by Rev. Thos. Binney*, London, 1856; H. Alt, *Der christliche Kultus nach seinen verschiedenen Entwickelungsformen und seinen einzelnen Theilen*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1860; Ivan Borovnitsky, *Origin and Composition of the Roman Catholic Liturgy, and its Difference from that of the Orthodox Church*, London, 1863; J. M. Neale, *Essays on Liturgiology and Church History: with an Appendix on liturgical Quotations from the Isapostolic Fathers by J. Moultrie*, 8 vols., ib. 1867; F. Probst, *Liturgie der drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte*, Tübingen, 1870; H. C. Romanoff, *The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, ib. 1871; T. Bernard, *Cours de liturgie romaine*, Paris, 1884–93; P. L. P. Guéranger, *Institutions liturgiques*, ib. 1885; idem, *The Liturgical Year*, Worcester, 1895; H. Hering, *Hülfsbuch zur Einführung in das liturgische Studium*, Wittenberg, 1888; P. Freeman, *The Principles of Divine Service*, London, 1889; H. M. Luckock, *The Divine Liturgy*, ib. 1889; F. Probst, *Liturgie des vierten Jahrhunderts und deren Reform*, Münster, 1893; V. Thalhofer, *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik*, Freiburg, 1894; L. Clugnet, *Dictionnaire grèc-français des noms liturgiques en usage dans l'église grecque*, Paris, 1895; A. Ebner, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Missale Romanum im Mittelalter*, Freiburg, 1896; F. Magani, *L'Antica liturgia Romana*, Milano, 1897–99; J. Comper, *A Popular Handbook of the Origin, Hist., and Structure of Liturgies*, London, 1898; G. Rietschel, *Lehrbuch der Liturgik*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1899; F. Cabrol, *Le Livre de la prière antique*, Paris, 1900; idem, *Dictionnaire;* J. W. Legg, *Some Local Reforms of the Divine Service Attempted on the Continent in the Sixteenth Century*, London, 1901; L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship, a Study of the Latin Liturgy up to the time of Charlemagne*, ib. 1904; Nerses Ter-Mikaelian, *Das armenische Hymnarium. Studien zu seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Leipsic, 1905; F. Cabrol, *Les Origines liturgiques*, Paris, 1906; P. C. Yorke, *The Roman Liturgy, a Hist. and Explanation of the Ceremonies and Prayers*, San Francisco, 1906; P. Drews, *Die clementinische Liturgie in Rom*, Tübingen, 1906; W. H. Frere, *The Principles of Religious Ceremonial*, London, 1906; V. Staley, *Studies in Ceremonial: Essays illustrative of English Ceremonial*, London, 1907; H. Bäuerle, *Liturgie; Theorie des römisch-katholischen Kultus*, Regensburg, 1908; C. P. A. Burnett, *Ritual and Ceremonial*, London, 1908; L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétienne*, Paris, 1908; J. Braun, *Die liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient nach Ursprung und Entwicklung, Verwendung und Symbolik*, Freiburg, 1908; *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der byzantinischen Liturgie*, Berlin, 1908.

III.: For the Amen the most notable contribution is in Cabrol, *Dictionnaire*, fasc., vi., cols. 1554–73. Consult also: Bingham, *Origines*, XV., iii. 26; Thalhofer, ut sup., i. 512 sqq.; H. W. Hogg, in *JQR*, ix (1896), 1–23; E. F. von der Goltz, *Das Gebet in der ältesten Christenheit*, pp. 157 sqq., Leipsic, 1901; *DCA*, i. 75–76. On the Doxology consult: Chase, in *TS*, i. 3 (1891), 168 sqq.; Bingham, *Origines*, XIV., i. 8, ii. 1–2; V. Thalhofer, ut sup., i. 490 sqq., ii. 77 sqq.; E. C. Achelis, *Lehrbuch der praktischen Theologie*, i. 394, Leipsic, 1898; E. F. von der Goltz, ut sup., pp. 157 sqq.; *DCA*, i. 577–579. For Alleluia consult: Cabrol, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. v., cols. 1226–1246; Bingham, *Origines*, XIV., ii. 4; V. Thalhofer, ut sup., i. 515 sqq., ii. 100 sqq.; O'Mahony, in *Dublin Review*, cxx (1897), 345–350; L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, London, 1904; *DCA*, i. 55–56; *DB*, ii. 287; *EB*, ii. 1943–44. On the Hosanna consult: V. Thalhofer, ut sup., ii. 185; Bingham, *Origines*, II., ix. 3, XIV., ii. 5; *DCA*, i. 785; *DB*, ii. 418–419; *EB*, ii. 2117–20; *DCA*, i. 749–751. On the *Kyrie eleison* consult: V. Thalfhofer, ut sup., i. 495-500; E. C. Achelis, in *Monatsschrift für Gottesdienst und kirchliche Kunst*, iv. 161 sqq., 211 sqq.; L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, London, 1904. On the *Pax vobiscum* consult: Bingham, *Origines*, XIII., viii. 13, x. 8, XIV., iv. 14, XV., iii. 2; V. Thalhofer, ut sup., i. 503 sqq., ii. 82, 85, 422; *DCA*, i. 572.

LIUDGER, lūd′ger (**LUDGER**), **SAINT:** Missionary to the Frisians and first bishop of Münster; b. in Frisia, probably between 740 and 750; d. at Billerbeck (15 m. w.n.w. of Münster) Mar. 26, 809. He was educated at Utrecht, and thence went, about 767, to York, where for a year he enjoyed the instruction of Alcuin and was ordained deacon. After remaining there for some time longer, he returned to Frisia and was employed as a missionary among his fellow countrymen by

Alberic, the successor of his old teacher Gregory. When Alberic was consecrated bishop of Utrecht at Cologne in 777, Liudger was ordained priest and spent seven years at Dockum, although he passed the autumn of each year at Utrecht as a teacher in the school of that city. An invasion of the Saxons under Widukind in 784 forced him to leave Frisia, and he went to Rome and Monte Cassino, where he spent two and a half years in the famous monastery, although he himself did not become a monk. On his return, Charlemagne, to whom he was recommended by Alcuin, gave him as a new sphere of activity the five Frisian districts of Hugmerchi, Hunusga, Fivilga, Emisga, and Federitga, as well as the island of Bank. There he worked with eminent success, extending his labors as far as Fosetesland (Heligoland), his center of administration being the abbey of Lotusa (doubtless the modern Zele, 14 m. e. of Ghent). After the country of the Saxons had become so far pacified that the establishment of bishops became feasible, Liudger, who seems previously to have declined the bishopric of Treves, was consecrated to the see of southern Westphalia with his episcopal seat at Mimigernaford, the modern Münster, his diocese including the five Frisian districts in which he had formerly labored. The precise date of this event is uncertain, but in Jan., 802, a document terms him abbot, the first to designate him bishop being dated Apr. 23, 805. Of his episcopal activity little is known. He built a cathedral at Mimigernaford and probably erected a church of the Virgin at Ueberwasser. His chief foundation, however, was the monastery of Werden on the Ruhr, but here again the date is unknown, although a document of May 1, 801, shows that the relics which he had brought from Rome were already there. The only literary work of Liudger was his biography of his teacher Gregory (*ASB*, Aug., v. 254).

Later tradition made Liudger a Benedictine and asserted that he baptised Widukind, calling him by his own name. A reminiscence of this legend is found in the third " adventure " of the *Nibelungenlied*, where the Saxon duke is called Liudegêr. He is also connected traditionally with the diocese of Halberstadt, of which his brother Hildegrim, really bishop of Châlons and rector of Werden, is said to have been bishop, while Liudger himself is described as establishing the *Liudgeristift* in Helmstadt, although this seems to have been merely a colony from Werden, founded in the beginning of the tenth century with Liudger as its patron saint. (G. UHLHORN †.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Special study has been made of the sources by W. Diekamp, who has collected the early *Vitæ* in *Geschichtsquellen des Bisthums Münster*, vol. iv., Münster, 1881, also published separately, ib. 1882. The *Vitæ* are collected with less completeness, with commentary, in *ASB*, Mar., iii. 626–661; in *MPL*, xcix. 769–796; and ed. G. H. Pertz, in *MGH*, *Script.*, ii (1829), 403–425. Modern discussions are: C. Krimphove, *Leben und Wirken des heiligen Ludgerus*, Münster, 1860; idem, *Der heilige Ludgerus*, ib. 1886; A. Hüsing, *Der heilige Liudger*, ib. 1878; L. T. W. Pingsmann, *Der heilige Liudgerus*, Freiburg, 1879; K. F. von Richthofen, *Untersuchungen über friesische Rechtsgeschichte*, ii. 1, pp. 376 sqq., 398 sqq., Berlin, 1882; G. F. Maclear, *Apostles of Mediæval Europe*, pp. 143–150, London, 1888; E. Knodt, *Sturm, Ansgar, Liudger*, Gütersloh, 1900; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, iv. 359–362, v. 659–661; Hauck, *KD*, ii. 317 sqq., 369 sqq.; *DCB*, iii. 729–731; Neander, *Christian Church*, iii. 79–81; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xii. 218, xiii. 66.

END OF VOL VI.

YO-BNX-703